

No. 11-4254

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

DANIEL and GERALDINE SHERZER,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

HOMESTAR MORTGAGE SERVICES, ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees,

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU,

Amicus Curiae.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

**BRIEF OF THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION
BUREAU AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS AND REVERSAL**

Leonard J. Kennedy
General Counsel
To-Quyen Truong
Deputy General Counsel
David M. Gossett
Assistant General Counsel
Rachel Rodman
Senior Counsel
Peter G. Wilson
Kristin Bateman
Attorneys

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU
1700 G Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20552
(202) 435-7964

April 13, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| TABLE OF CITATIONS..... | ii |
| QUESTION PRESENTED..... | 1 |
| INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> | 2 |
| STATEMENT..... | 4 |
| A. Statutory and Regulatory Background..... | 4 |
| B. Facts..... | 8 |
| SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... | 11 |
| ARGUMENT..... | 13 |
| Section 1635 Defines The Time For Consumers To Notify Their Lenders, Not The Time For Consumers To Sue Their Lenders. | 13 |
| A. Consumers exercise their right to rescind by notifying their lenders within the three-year period provided under § 1635(f)..... | 13 |
| B. Consumers are not required also to sue their lenders within the three-year period provided under § 1635(f)..... | 17 |
| C. <i>Beach</i> does not require consumers to file suit within the three- year period provided under § 1635(f). | 20 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 28 |

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Pages

Statutes

Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 111-243 (2010).....3

Truth in Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1601 *et seq.*.....*passim*

15 U.S.C. § 1601(a)4

15 U.S.C. § 1635.....*passim*

15 U.S.C. § 1635(a)*passim*

15 U.S.C. § 1635(b).....*passim*

15 U.S.C. § 1635(e)(1).....4

15 U.S.C. § 1635(f).....*passim*

15 U.S.C. § 1635(i)18

15 U.S.C. § 1640.....4, 10, 26

Pub. L. No. 96-221 § 612 (1980)5

Pub. L. No. 103-29824

12 U.S.C. § 5581(b)(1).....3

12 U.S.C. § 5581(d)3

15 U.S.C. § 78i(e).....24

29 U.S.C. § 111324

Regulations

12 C.F.R. § 226.23(a)(2).....9

Regulation Z, 76 Fed. Reg. 79,768-1, 79,803 (Dec. 22, 2011) (codified at 12 C.F.R. § 1026 *et seq.*).....*passim*

12 C.F.R. § 1026.15.....4

12 C.F.R. § 1026.15(a) 6, 15

12 C.F.R. § 1026.15(d).....7

12 C.F.R. § 1026.23.....4

12 C.F.R. § 1026.23(a) 6, 14

12 C.F.R. § 1026.23(d).....7
 12 C.F.R. pt. 1026, App. H. Model form H-8(A)6
 12 C.F.R. pt. 1026, supp. I, subpt. B.....7
 75 Fed. Reg. 57,252 (Sept. 20, 2010)3
 42 Pa. C.S.A. § 5524(5)10
 N.Y. UCC § 4-A-505.....23

Cases

Acton v. Deliran, 737 P.2d 996 (Utah 1987)19
Allstate Prop. and Cas. Ins. Co. v. Squires, 667 F.3d 388 (3d Cir. 2012).....8
Am. Type Founders’ Co. v. Packer, 130 Cal. 459 (1900)18
Atl. Sounding Co., Inc. v. Townsend, 557 U.S. 404, 129 S. Ct. 2561 (2009)25
Balam-Chuc v. Mukasey, 547 F.3d 1044 (9th Cir. 2008)23
Beach v. Ocwen Fed. Bank, 523 U.S. 410 (1998)*passim*
Belini v. Washington Mutual Bank, FA, 412 F.3d 17 (1st Cir. 2005) 13, 20
Blazevska v. Raytheon Aircraft Co., 522 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2008).....24
Bradford v. HSBC Mortg. Corp., 799 F. Supp. 2d 625 (E.D. Va. 2011) 22, 26
Brown v. Techdata Corp., Inc., 234 S.E.2d 787 (Ga. 1977).....19
Cunningham v. Pettigrew, 169 F. 335 (8th Cir. 1909).....16
E.T.C. Corp. v. Title Guarantee & Trust Co., 271 N.Y. 124 (1936)19
Fallon Elec. Co. Inc. v. Cincinnati Ins. Co., 121 F.3d 125 (3d Cir. 1997)17
Florida Dept. of Revenue v. Piccadilly Cafeterias, Inc., 554 U.S. 33 (2008)25
Geraghty v. BAC Home Loans Serv. LP, No. 11-336, 2011 WL 3920248
 (D. Minn. Sept. 7, 2011).....2
Goess v. A.D.H. Holding Corp., 85 F.2d 72 (2d Cir. 1936).....16
Grabowski v. Bank of Boston, 997 F. Supp. 111 (D. Mass. 1997).....24
Graham Cnty. Soil & Water Conservation Dist. v. United States ex rel. Wilson,
 545 U.S. 409 (2005).....26
Griggs v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 385 F.3d 440 (4th Cir. 2004) 15, 19
Haumont v. Security State Bank, 374 N.W.2d 2 (Neb. 1985)15
Household Credit Servs. v. Pfennig, 541 U.S. 232 (2004).....3

Iacono v. Office of Persl. Mgmt., 974 F.2d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 1992)23

In re Cmty. Bank of N. Va., 418 F.3d 277 (3d Cir. 2005)9

In re Hunter, 400 B.R. 651 (N.D. Ill. 2009)..... 2, 26

Jobns v. Coffee, 133 P. 4 (Wash. 1913).....16

Jones v. Bohn, 311 N.W.2d 211 (S.D. 1981).....19

Jones v. Saxon Mortg., Inc., 537 F.3d 320 (4th Cir. 1998).....14

Lampf, Pleva, Lipkind, Prupis & Petigrow v. Gilbertson, 501 U.S. 350 (1991).....24

Ma v. Merrill Lynch, 597 F.3d 84 (2d Cir. 2010)23

McKenna v. First Horizon Home Loan Corp., 475 F.3d 418 (1st Cir. 2007) 14, 20

McOmie-Gray v. Bank of Am., 667 F.3d 1325 (9th Cir. 2012)
 (petition for rehearing pending).....*passim*

Omlid v. Sweeney, 484 N.W.2d 486 (N.D. 1992)19

Omni Capital Int’l, Ltd. v. Rudolf Wolff & Co., 484 U.S. 97 (1987).....25

Peterson v. Highland Music, Inc., 140 F.3d 1313 (9th Cir. 1998)19

Phelps v. U.S. Life Credit Ins. Co., 984 S.W.2d 425 (Ark. 1999).....19

Prewitt v. Sunnymead Orchard Co., 189 Cal. 723 (1922).....18

Rachbach v. Cogswell, 547 F.2d 502 (10th Cir. 1976).....15

Radford v. Gen. Dynamics Corp., 151 F.3d 396 (5th Cir. 1998).....24

Regatos v. North Fork Bank, 257 F. Supp. 2d 632 (S.D.N.Y. 2003)23

Rosenfield v. HSBC Bank, USA, No. 10-cv-00058, 2010 WL 3489926 (D. Colo. Aug. 31, 2010) *appeal docketed*, No. 10-1442 (10th Cir. Sept. 27, 2010)22

Rossmann v. Fleet Bank (R.I.) Nat. Ass’n, 280 F.3d 384 (3d Cir. 2002)27

Smith v. Fidelity Consumer Disc. Co., 898 F.2d 896 (3d Cir. 1990)9

Sobieniak v. BAC Home Loans Serv., LP, 2011 WL 6122318 (D. Minn. Dec. 8, 2011) *appeal docketed*, No. 12-1053 (8th Cir. Jan. 9, 2012)25

Sterlin v. Biomune Sys., 154 F.3d 1191 (10th Cir. 1998).....22

Taylor v. Domestic Remodeling, Inc., 97 F.3d 96 (5th Cir. 1996).....14

Wilcox Trux v. Rosenberger, 156 Minn. 487 (1923)16

Williams v. Homestake Mortg. Co., 968 F.2d 1137 (11th Cir. 1992).....14, 15, 16

Williams v. Wells Fargo Home Mortg., Inc., 410 Fed. Appx. 495, No. 10-493, 2011 WL 395978 (3d Cir. Feb. 8, 2011)*passim*

Zengen, Inc. v. Comerica Bank, 158 P.3d 800 (Cal. 2007).....23

Other Authorities

114 CONG. REC. H14388 (daily ed. May 22, 1968) (statement of Rep. Sullivan)4

114 CONG. REC H14384 (daily ed. May 22, 1968) (statement of Rep. Patman).....4

Dan B. Dobbs, *Handbook of Remedies* § 4.8.....19

Henry Campbell Black, *A Treatise On The Rescission Of Contracts And Cancellation Of Written Instruments*, Vol. 2, p. 1355, § 577 (1916)16

S. REP. NO. 96-368 (1979), *reprinted in* 1980 U.S.C.C.A.N. 236.....26

QUESTION PRESENTED

Section 125 of the Truth in Lending Act (TILA or Act), 15 U.S.C. § 1601 *et seq.*, provides consumers a statutory right to rescind certain types of mortgage loans. Consumers can rescind their loans for three days following consummation of the loan or delivery of the disclosures mandated by the Act, whichever occurs later. 15 U.S.C. § 1635(a). A consumer exercises his right to rescind “by notifying the creditor, in accordance with regulations of the [Consumer Financial Protection] Bureau, of his intention to do so.” *Id.* The right to rescind expires three years after consummation of the loan or upon sale of the home, whichever occurs first. *Id.* § 1635(f).

This appeal presents a question concerning the timeliness of lawsuits arising out of a consumer’s exercise of the right to rescind under the Act: When a consumer timely exercises an allegedly valid right of rescission by providing notice to the lender within three years, but the lender does not recognize the rescission, must the consumer also file a lawsuit against the lender within three years?

INTEREST OF THE *AMICUS CURIAE*

This case concerns what consumers must do to rescind their mortgage loans under TILA and its implementing regulation, Regulation Z, 12 C.F.R. § 1026 *et seq.*, before their right to rescind expires three years after obtaining their loans. Most lower courts have concluded that consumers must both *exercise* their right of rescission—by providing notice to their lenders—and *sue* their lenders to resolve any disputes that arise regarding the rescission before the right to rescind expires. *See, e.g., Geraghty v. BAC Home Loans Servicing LP*, No. 11-336, 2011 WL 3920248 (D. Minn. Sept. 7, 2011). A minority of lower courts hold that consumers must exercise their right of rescission by notifying their lenders before the right to rescind expires, but that courts can determine in subsequent litigation whether the rescission was valid, even if that litigation begins after the three-year period has run. *See, e.g., In re Hunter*, 400 B.R. 651 (N.D. Ill. 2009).

Two appellate courts have addressed this question. The Ninth Circuit has adopted the majority view, and an unpublished opinion of this Court has taken the same position. *See McOmie-Gray v. Bank of Am. Home Loans*, 667 F.3d 1325 (9th Cir. 2012); *Williams v. Wells Fargo Home Mortg., Inc.*, 410 Fed. App'x 495, No. 10-493, 2011 WL 395978 (3d Cir. Feb. 8, 2011). Other appellate courts are likely to reach the issue soon. *See* Bureau Mot. for Leave to File as *Amicus Curiae* at n.2 (Mar. 1, 2012) (listing ten appeals pending in four circuits presenting the same issue).

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is “the primary source for interpretation and application of truth-in-lending law.” *Household Credit Servs. v. Pfennig*, 541 U.S. 232, 238 (2004). The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act transferred exclusive authority to interpret and promulgate rules regarding TILA from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to the Bureau on July 21, 2011. *See* Pub. L. No. 111-243, §§ 1061(b)(1), (d) (2010), *codified at* 12 U.S.C. §§ 5581(b)(1), (d); *Designated Transfer Date*, 75 Fed. Reg. 57,252 (Sept. 20, 2010). The Bureau, exercising this authority, republished Regulation Z in December 2011. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. 79,768-01, 79,803 (Dec. 22, 2011) (codified at 12 C.F.R. § 1026 *et seq.*). The Bureau therefore has a substantial interest in ensuring the correct and consistent interpretation of TILA and Regulation Z.

In the view of the Bureau, the interpretation of TILA adopted by the majority of courts, including the court below, erroneously restricts consumers’ right of rescission. Accordingly, the Bureau is filing *amicus* briefs in appeals pending in four circuits (including this one). To rescind a mortgage loan under TILA and Regulation Z, consumers must notify their lenders within three years of obtaining the loan, but are not also required to sue their lenders within that same timeframe if the lenders contest the rescission.

STATEMENT

A. Statutory and Regulatory Background

Congress enacted TILA in 1968 to establish a comprehensive scheme requiring lenders to disclose credit terms to consumers, with the aim of promoting the “informed use of credit.” 15 U.S.C. § 1601(a). TILA requires lenders to provide “clear and accurate disclosures of terms dealing with things like finance charges, annual percentage rates of interest, and the borrower’s rights.” *Beach v. Ocwen Fed. Bank*, 523 U.S. 410, 412 (1998). TILA entitles consumers to statutory and actual damages to remedy violations of its disclosure and other provisions. 15 U.S.C. § 1640.

Section 125 of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1635, also provides consumers a statutory right to rescind certain types of mortgage loans by giving timely notice to their lenders. The right to rescind applies to open-end and closed-end loans secured by a lien on the consumer’s principal dwelling (*e.g.*, home equity lines of credit, some second mortgages, and refinances). *See generally* 12 C.F.R. §§ 1026.15, 1026.23. It does not apply to purchase-money mortgages. 15 U.S.C. § 1635(e)(1).

Congress enacted § 1635 in response to fraudulent home-improvement schemes in which “homeowners, particularly the poor,” were “trick[ed] * * * into signing contracts at exorbitant rates, which turn out to be liens on the family residences.” 114 CONG. REC. 14,388 (1968) (statement of Rep. Sullivan); *see id.* at 14,384 (statement of Rep. Patman). Section 1635 combats this unfairness by requiring lenders to disclose the material terms of transactions, providing consumers an

opportunity to reflect on those terms, and granting consumers a statutory right to cancel transactions if they have a change of heart. Section 1635(a) provides:

[T]he [consumer] shall have the right to rescind [qualifying mortgage loans] until midnight of the third business day following the consummation of the transaction or the delivery of the information and rescission forms required under this section together with a statement containing the material disclosures required under this subchapter, whichever is later, by notifying the creditor, in accordance with regulations of the Bureau, of his intention to do so.

In operation, § 1635(a) provides consumers a three-day “cooling off” period to cancel their loans for any reason. But this period is meaningful only if consumers are aware of the material terms of their transactions and their right to cancel. Thus, § 1635(a) allows consumers to rescind until midnight of the third business day following the later of (1) loan consummation, (2) delivery of the notice of the right to cancel, or (3) delivery of the material disclosures.

In 1980, Congress amended § 1635 to limit the time period within which consumers must exercise their right to rescind. *See* Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 612 (1980).

As amended, § 1635(f) provides:

(f) Time limit for exercise of right

[A consumer’s] right of rescission shall expire three years after the date of consummation of the transaction or upon the sale of the property, whichever occurs first, notwithstanding the fact that the information and forms required under this section or any other disclosures required under this part have not been delivered to [the consumer].

To rescind a loan, the consumer must “notify[] the creditor, in accordance with regulations of the Bureau, of his intention to do so” within the timeframe provided by § 1635(f). 15 U.S.C. § 1635(a). Regulation Z, in turn, specifies that “[t]o exercise the right to rescind, the consumer shall notify the creditor of the rescission by mail, telegram or other means of written communication.” 12 C.F.R. §§ 1026.15(a)(2), 1026.23(a)(2). The Bureau promulgated several model forms for this purpose. *See* 12 C.F.R. pt. 1026, App’x H. Model form H-8, for example, provides:

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>H-8—Rescission Model Form (General)</p> | |
| <p>NOTICE OF RIGHT TO CANCEL</p> | |
| <p>Your Right to Cancel You are entering into a transaction that will result in a [mortgage/lien/ security interest] [on/in] your home. You have a legal right under federal law to cancel this transaction, without cost, within three business days from whichever of the following events occurs last:</p> <p>(1) the date of the transaction, which is _____; or</p> <p>(2) the date you received your Truth in Lending disclosures; or</p> <p>(3) the date you received this notice of your right to cancel.</p> <p>If you cancel the transaction, the [mortgage/lien/security interest] is also cancelled. Within 20 calendar days after we receive your notice, we must take the steps necessary to reflect the fact that the [mortgage/lien/security interest] [on/in] your home has been cancelled, and we must return to you any money or property you have given to us or to anyone else in connection with this transaction.</p> <p>You may keep any money or property we have given you until we have done the things mentioned above, but you must then offer to return the money or property. If it is impractical or unfair for you to return the property, you must offer its reasonable value. You may offer to return the property at your home or at the location of the property. Money must be returned to the address below. If we do not take possession of the money or property within 20 calendar days of your offer, you may keep it without further obligation.</p> | <p>How to Cancel If you decide to cancel this transaction, you may do so by notifying us in writing, at _____ (creditor’s name and business address).</p> <p>You may use any written statement that is signed and dated by you and states your intention to cancel, or you may use this notice by dating and signing below. Keep one copy of this notice because it contains important information about your rights.</p> <p>If you cancel by mail or telegram, you must send the notice no later than midnight of _____ (date) (or midnight of the third business day following the latest of the three events listed above). If you send or deliver your written notice to cancel some other way, it must be delivered to the above address no later than that time.</p> <p>I WISH TO CANCEL</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Consumer’s Signature Date</p> |

When a consumer exercises a valid right of rescission under § 1635(a), the transaction is cancelled. The effect of cancellation is governed by § 1635(b): The consumer “is not liable for any finance or other charge, and any security interest given by the obligor * * * becomes void upon such a rescission.” 15 U.S.C. § 1635(b); 12 C.F.R. §§ 1026.15(d)(1), 1026.23(d)(1). Section 1635(b) also governs the process of cancellation: Within 20 calendar days after receipt of a notice of rescission, the lender must return any money or property given in connection with the transaction and take all necessary action to reflect the termination of the security interest. 15 U.S.C. § 1635(b); 12 C.F.R. §§ 1026.15(d)(2), 1026.23(d)(2). When the lender has performed its obligations, the consumer must tender the money or property to the lender or, if that is impracticable or inequitable, must tender the property’s reasonable value. 15 U.S.C. § 1635(b); 12 C.F.R. §§ 1026.15(d)(3), 1026.23(d)(3). This statutory procedure may be modified by court order.¹ 15 U.S.C. § 1635(b); 12 C.F.R. §§ 1026.15(d)(4), 1026.23(d)(4).

¹ For example, a court might modify these procedures if a lender is in bankruptcy proceedings and prohibited from returning anything to the creditor, or if the equities otherwise dictate that modification is appropriate. 12 C.F.R. pt. 1026, supp. I, subpt. B at 15(d)(4).

B. Facts²

This case concerns Daniel and Geraldine Sherzer's alleged rescission of a mortgage loan under § 1635. On August 26, 2004, the Sherzers were supposed to obtain a mortgage from Homestar Mortgage Services to refinance the existing mortgage on their home. Dkt. 36 at 2. Instead, Homestar gave the Sherzers two loans, one for \$705,000 and a second, smaller loan for \$171,000, and then transferred the loans to HSBC Bank USA. *Id.* One year later, on August 26, 2005, the Sherzers obtained a mortgage from appellee CIT Group that was used to pay off the smaller Homestar loan. *Id.*

On May 11, 2007, less than three years after the 2004 refinancing, the Sherzers sent notices of rescission to Homestar, HSBC and CIT Group. *Id.* HSBC agreed to refund \$10,330.96 in costs, interest and fees that the Sherzers had paid towards the smaller loan before it had been paid off. Dkt. 16 at 6. HSBC did not agree to rescind its larger loan, and CIT Group did not agree to rescind its loan. *Id.*

The Sherzers sued HSBC, CIT Group, and several other defendants in federal court on November 30, 2007. Dkt. 36 at 3. The complaint requested an order requiring HSBC and CIT Group "to satisfy their respective security interests in the

² Because this is an appeal from an order granting the appellees' motion for judgment on the pleadings, the Court and the Bureau must accept the allegations in the appellants' pleadings as true and draw all reasonable inferences in the appellants' favor. *Allstate Prop. and Cas. Ins. Co. v. Squires*, 667 F.3d 388, 390 (3d Cir. 2012). The Bureau takes no position on the merits of the appellants' claims.

Home, desist from [sic] making any claim for finance charges arising out of this transaction, and that all the Defendants return all of the Plaintiffs' payments and be barred from making any claim for payments against the Plaintiffs." Dkt. 1 at 6. The complaint sought damages, attorneys' fees and costs. *Id.*

After several defendants, including Homestar and HSBC, moved to dismiss the Sherzers' complaint as untimely, the district court (McLaughlin, J.) referred the matter to Magistrate Judge Hey. Magistrate Judge Hey recommended denying the motion to dismiss. *See* Dkt. 36 at 15-25.

The district court initially adopted Magistrate Judge Hey's Report and Recommendation with respect to the motion to dismiss. Dkt. 38 at 2-4. The court acknowledged that snippets of two decisions of this Court could be read to suggest that a lawsuit was required to rescind a loan under the Act, but noted that in neither case "did the facts require the court to differentiate between rescission by notice or suit, and in neither case did the court indicate a purposeful differentiation between the two." *Id.* at 3 (discussing *Smith v. Fidelity Consumer Disc. Co.*, 898 F.2d 896 (3d Cir. 1990) and *In re Cmty. Bank of N. Va.*, 418 F.3d 277 (3d Cir. 2005)). Because "neither statement" relied on by Homestar and HSBC "was the holding of the case," *id.* at 2, the court understood that those statements were not binding.

Turning instead to "the language of the statute" and Regulation Z, the court found that "a consumer may rescind 'by mail, telegram or other means of written communication.'" *Id.* at 3 (quoting 12 C.F.R. § 226.23(a)(2)). The court also concluded

that the Act was “silent” regarding “the time allotted for filing a suit to enforce rescission after the consumer has given notice.” *Id.* at 4. The court believed it had “two options for resolution of this issue.” It could “apply the relevant ‘local’ statute of limitations,” which would “result in a two-year limitation,” *id.* (citing 42 Pa. C.S.A. § 5524(5)); or, alternatively, it “could fill the gap by analogy to 15 U.S.C. § 1640(e).” *Id.* The court concluded that the Sherzers’ suit was timely “[u]nder either standard,” and so denied Homestar and HSBC’s objections to the magistrate judge’s recommendation. *Id.*

Some time later, Homestar and HSBC asked the lower court to revisit this determination. *See* Dkt. 52. Relying on this Court’s unpublished opinion in *Williams v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc.*, 410 Fed. App’x. 495 (3d Cir. 2011), Homestar and HSBC argued that the Sherzers’ “claim for TILA rescission is time-barred” because they had “mere[ly] invo[ked]” their right of rescission “by notice” within the three-year period provided in § 1635(f), and had not also sued within that period. Dkt. 52-2 at 6 (quoting *Williams*, 410 Fed. App’x at 499).

Magistrate Judge Hey, relying on *Williams*, agreed. The magistrate judge concluded that a consumer “may invoke the right to rescission by mere notice,” but that “[m]ere invocation without more” “will not preserve the right [to rescind] beyond the three-year period.” Dkt. 74 at 7 (quoting *Williams*, 410 Fed. App’x. at 499). Because the Sherzers’ notice of rescission “did nothing to stop the clock,” and the

Sherzers had not filed suit within three years of receiving their loan, the magistrate judge concluded that their lawsuit was time-barred. *Id.* at 8.

The district court adopted Magistrate Judge Hey's Report and Recommendation without additional analysis and granted HSBC and Homestar's motion for judgment on the pleadings, concluding that this suit was time-barred despite the Sherzers' allegation that they provided notice of rescission to Homestar and HSBC within three years of obtaining their loan. Dkt. 85.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Section 1635 grants consumers a unilateral right to rescind qualifying mortgage loans for up to three years after obtaining their loans. Under the plain terms of that provision, consumers are required to do only one thing before the three-year period expires—exercise their right to rescind by providing written notice to their lenders. Yet many courts, including the court below, have misread § 1635 to require something more. These courts hold that, if the rescission is contested, consumers also must sue their lenders within the same three-year timeframe. This interpretation of the Act is wrong, and it should be rejected.

Section 1635 establishes a private, non-judicial mechanism for consumers to rescind mortgage loans by providing notice to their lenders. Its requirements are uncomplicated. Section 1635(a) and Regulation Z specify that consumers exercise their right to rescind by providing written notice to their lenders. Section 1635(b) entitles consumers to relief when they exercise a valid rescission right. And § 1635(f)

limits the period of time consumers have to notify their lenders in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) and Regulation Z. This statutory scheme is consistent with the historical understanding that rescission may be achieved unilaterally upon notice to the counterparty to a contract. *See infra* Part A.

The district court erred in holding that the Act also requires consumers to file suit against their lender within the time provided under § 1635(f). Subsection (f) provides that the rescission right “expire[s]” three years after loan consummation. It does not refer to consumers bringing lawsuits. The absence of such language is consistent with the statutory purpose of providing consumers a non-judicial mechanism to rescind their loans. Consequently, interpreting § 1635(f) as controlling the time to file lawsuits makes little sense. Although litigation may ensue after a consumer exercises a unilateral right to rescind a loan, rescission itself is achieved as of the date the consumer provides notice. The purpose of any subsequent litigation is to determine if the consumer in fact had a right to rescind—and if so, to require the lender to follow the procedures set out in § 1635(b) and Regulation Z. *See infra* Part B.

The Supreme Court’s decision in *Beach v. Ocwen Federal Bank*, 523 U.S. 410 (1998), is not to the contrary. Although *Beach* did not resolve the question presented in this case, many courts, including the district court below, have invoked *Beach* to hold that § 1635(f) is a “statute of repose” that, *by definition*, requires consumers to file suit. These courts incorrectly assume that, because § 1635(f) has features of a statute of repose, it cannot define only the time to provide notice. But statutes of repose are

often satisfied by acts other than filing lawsuits. Thus, even accepting that § 1635(f) is a “statute of repose,” it does not require consumers to file suit within three years of obtaining their loan. *See infra* Part C.

The understanding that § 1635(f) is satisfied by notice is compelled by the plain language of the Act and the statutory purpose. Requiring consumers also to file suit within the time provided under subsection (f) disregards both. The holding below should be reversed.

ARGUMENT

Section 1635 Defines The Time For Consumers To Notify Their Lenders, Not The Time For Consumers To Sue Their Lenders.

A. Consumers exercise their right to rescind by notifying their lenders within the three-year period provided under § 1635(f).

Section 1635(f) defines the period of time during which consumers who do not receive the disclosures required under the Act are permitted to rescind their loan. It provides that the “right of rescission shall expire three years after the date of consummation of the transaction or upon the sale of the property, whichever occurs first[.]” This language specifies *when* consumers must rescind, but it is silent on *how* they must do so. The answer to that question is supplied by §§ 1635(a) and (b) and Regulation Z.

“[S]ection 1635 is written with the goal of making the rescission process a private one, worked out between creditor and debtor without the intervention of the courts.” *Belini v. Washington Mut. Bank, FA*, 412 F.3d 17, 25 (1st Cir. 2005). Thus,

when consumers have a right to rescind under § 1635 and “elect[] to rescind, the mechanics of rescission are uncomplicated.” *McKenna v. First Horizon Home Loan Corp.*, 475 F.3d 418, 422 (1st Cir. 2007). Section 1635(a) provides that the consumer “shall have the right to rescind” “by notifying the creditor” using “appropriate forms” provided “in accordance with regulations of the Bureau.” Consistent with this section’s unambiguous meaning, Regulation Z requires consumers to “exercise the right to rescind” by “notify[ing] the creditor of the rescission” in writing. 12 C.F.R. §§ 1026.15(a)(2), 1026.23(a)(2).

Section 1635(b) entitles consumers to relief when they exercise a valid rescission right: “When an obligor *exercises his right to rescind* * * * he is not liable for any finance or other charge, and any security interest given by the obligor * * * becomes void upon such a rescission.” (emphasis added). Thus, when a consumer has a right to rescind under the Act, “all that the consumer need do is notify the creditor of his intent to rescind. The agreement is then automatically rescinded.” *Williams v. Homestake Mortg. Co.*, 968 F.2d 1137, 1140 (11th Cir. 1992).

The principle that consumers exercise the TILA right of rescission through notice is well established. *See McOmie-Gray*, 667 F.3d at 1327 (“Regulation Z * * * confirms that notification is the means by which borrowers exercise their right to rescind.”); *Jones v. Saxon Mortg., Inc.*, 537 F.3d 320, 325 (4th Cir. 1998) (“In order to exercise a right to rescind, a borrower must notify the creditor of the rescission by mail, telegram, or other means of written communication.”); *Taylor v. Domestic*

Remodeling, Inc., 97 F.3d 96, 98 (5th Cir. 1996) (*per curiam*) (“In order to exercise the right to rescind, the consumer shall notify the creditor of the rescission by mail, telegram or other means of written communication.”); *Williams*, 968 F.2d at 1139 (“Congress provided the consumer with the right to rescind a credit transaction under § 1635(a) solely by notifying the creditor within set time limits of his intent to rescind.”); *Rachbach v. Cogswell*, 547 F.2d 502, 505 (10th Cir. 1976) (“Section 1635(a) requires only that the obligor exercise his right of rescission by notifying the creditor within the prescribed time limit of his intent to rescind.”). The Bureau is not aware of any contrary appellate authority.

Rescinding transactions through notice is not unique to TILA. Since “the days of the divided bench,” courts have recognized two types of rescission—rescission in equity and rescission at law. *Griggs v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Company*, 385 F.3d 440, 445-46 (4th Cir. 2004). Rescission in equity is “effected by the decree of the equity court which entertains the action for the express purpose of rescinding the contract and rendering a decree granting such relief.” *Id.* at 446 (quoting *Haumont v. Security State Bank*, 374 N.W. 2d 2, 7 (Neb. 1985)). Rescission at law, by contrast, occurs when one party “has a right to unilaterally avoid a contract.” *Id.*

Rescission at law is achieved “when the plaintiff gives notice to the defendant that the transaction has been avoided and tenders to the defendant the benefits received by the plaintiff under the contract.” *Id.* at 445-46. This form of rescission is “a fact, the assertion by one party to [an] avoidable contract of his right (if such he

had) to avoid it, and when the fact is made known to the other party, whether by a suit or in any other unequivocal way, the rescission is complete.” *Cunningham v. Pettigrew*, 169 F. 335, 341 (8th Cir. 1909); *accord, e.g., Goess v. A.D.H. Holding Corp.*, 85 F.2d 72, 74 (2d Cir. 1936) (a party “may exercise the power to avoid the transaction by giving notice of rescission, demanding the return of the consideration given, and offering to restore what he received” and the rescission “becomes fixed as of that time”); *Wilcox Trux v. Rosenberger*, 195 N.W. 489, 490-91 (Minn. 1923) (rescission need not be awarded by the court, but rather “may be by the unaided act of the defrauded party”); *Johns v. Coffee*, 133 P. 4, 7 (Wash. 1913) (rejecting argument that “the mere giving notice of rescission to the corporate officers is not in itself sufficient to accomplish a rescission”); 2 Henry Black, *A Treatise On The Rescission Of Contracts And Cancellation Of Written Instruments*, § 577 (1916).

Read together, subsections (a) and (b) and Regulation Z provide consumers a unilateral right to rescind their loan agreement upon notice to their lender. The right to rescind under § 1635 is therefore in the nature of rescission at law.³ Subsection (f) then defines the maximum period of time consumers have to rescind their loans by notifying their lenders in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) and Regulation Z.

³ Section 1635(b) reflects “a reordering of common law rules governing rescission,” in that it requires the lender to release the security interest before the consumer tenders. *Williams*, 968 F.2d at 1140. Section 1635(b) also allows a court to modify this default procedure. But as discussed *infra* Part B, the purpose of litigation following a rescission under TILA remains consistent with the purpose of litigation following a rescission at law.

Accordingly, the Act requires consumers to do only one thing before the right to rescind expires under § 1635(f): *exercise* their right to rescind by *notifying* their lenders of the rescission in writing.

B. Consumers are not required also to sue their lenders within the three-year period provided under § 1635(f).

Many courts, including this Court in its unpublished opinion in *Williams*,⁴ have erroneously required consumers to do more than exercise their right to rescind before the right expires under § 1635(f). When rescission is contested by the lender, these courts have held that the consumer also must sue the lender within § 1635(f)'s three-year timeframe. This interpretation of the Act is not supported by the plain language of § 1635 and misunderstands the role of litigation in a contested rescission.

Section 1635, like any statutory provision, must be interpreted in accordance with its “plain language.” *Beach*, 523 U.S. at 416. Section 1635(f) simply states that the “right of rescission shall expire three years after the date of consummation of the transaction or upon the sale of the property, whichever occurs first.” There is no language anywhere in § 1635 that requires consumers to file suit before the right to rescind expires. Certainly, neither the district court nor this Court in *Williams* identified any. The absence of such language is consistent with the statutory scheme: Consumers achieve rescission under TILA by providing notice, not by winning a

⁴ Because “[t]he Court does not regard [unpublished opinions] as binding precedent,” *Fallon Elec. Co., Inc. v. Cincinnati Ins. Co.*, 121 F.3d 125, 128 n.1 (3d Cir. 1997), *Williams* does not bind the panel in this case.

lawsuit. As a result, reading § 1635(f) to control the time for consumers to sue their lenders makes little sense.

Of course, litigation often ensues after consumers assert a unilateral right to rescind. If a lender disputes the rescission despite receiving timely notice, either party may file suit; and consumers also may raise the rescission as a defense in foreclosure. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 1635(i). The issue in these cases is not whether the consumer *may* rescind, but whether he *did* rescind. Under TILA, the rescission is effective as of the notice date or not at all; the subsequent litigation is simply to determine whether the lender's refusal to honor the rescission was justified. If the court finds the consumer had the right to rescind and properly exercised it, the rescission was achieved as of the notice date, and the court should order the lender to follow the procedures specified by § 1635(b), or modify them as appropriate. And if the court finds the consumer did not have (or improperly exercised) a right to rescind, the rescission was not achieved, and the loan remains in place.

This understanding of the purpose of litigation under § 1635 is consistent with rescission at law in other contexts. “[W]here one contracting party * * * serve[s] notice of rescission on the [other], ‘the rescission [is] complete and perfect’” as of the notice, not the litigation that may ensue. *Prewitt v. Sunnymead Orchard Co.*, 209 P. 995, 995 (Cal. 1922) (quoting *Am. Type Founders’ Co. v. Packer*, 62 P. 744, 746 (Cal. 1900)). The purpose of litigation following the unilateral rescission of a contract is not to ask the court to cancel the contract, because “[r]escission at law is accomplished without the

aid of a court,” and “is completed when, having grounds justifying rescission, one party to a contract notifies the other party that he intends to rescind the contract and return that which he received under the contract.” *Griggs*, 385 F.3d at 446 (quoting *Acton v. Deliran*, 737 P.2d 996, 999 n.5 (Utah 1987)). Instead, “the court merely grants restitution after the party seeking it has achieved rescission by its own acts.” *Phelps v. U.S. Life Credit Ins. Co.*, 984 S.W.2d 425, 427 (Ark. 1999).⁵

This Court’s unpublished opinion in *Williams*, which held that a notice of rescission merely “invoke[s] the right to rescin[nd],” 410 Fed. Appx. at 499, misunderstood the effect of the notice under § 1635(b). The notice does not “invoke” rescission; it *achieves* rescission, if the consumer properly exercised a valid rescission right under the Act. If, on the other hand, the consumer did not have a valid rescission right or improperly exercised that right, the notice is without effect. But regardless of the notice’s effect in a particular case, all § 1635(f) requires is that the

⁵ *Accord Peterson v. Highland Music, Inc.*, 140 F.3d 1313, 1322 (9th Cir. 1998) (after a party “has effected the rescission” by notice, “subsequent judicial proceedings are for the purpose of confirming and enforcing that rescission”); *Omlid v. Sweeney*, 484 N.W.2d 486, 490 & n.3 (N.D. 1992) (a suit following rescission at law “is essentially an action for restitution”); *Jones v. Bohn*, 311 N.W.2d 211, 213 (S.D. 1981) (a party can “enforce his rights” arising from a unilateral rescission that “has already been accomplished”); *Brown v. Techdata Corp., Inc.*, 234 S.E.2d 787, 792 (Ga. 1977) (a party who “rescinds the contract himself” may “then bring an action at law for money damages (more accurately termed restitution) or for recovery of [his] property”); *E.T.C. Corp. v. Title Guarantee & Trust Co.*, 271 N.Y. 124, 128 (1936) (rescission at law “reinvests [a party] with the legal title to the thing for the possession of which he subsequently sues”); Dobbs, *Handbook of Remedies* § 4.8 (“[I]f the plaintiff effects the rescission and the court gives a judgment for restitution if that is needed”).

consumer provides notice within three years. Once the consumer provides timely notice to the lender, it is irrelevant when the right to rescind “expires,” because the consumer has already rescinded. The timeliness of a lawsuit to require the lender to honor the rescission is completely independent of the timeliness of the rescission itself under § 1635(f).

In addition to being textually unsupported, the district court’s holding would vitiate the non-judicial rescission process established by Congress, with unintended and inefficient results. Requiring consumers not only to notify their lenders but also to bring suit within three years would incentivize consumers to file suit immediately, rather than working privately with their lenders to unwind the transaction. It would also encourage lenders to stonewall in response to a notice of rescission. Under the district court’s holding, all a lender need do is refuse to rescind and wait. If the consumer does not file suit within three years, even a valid rescission becomes a nullity. These consequences are inefficient for lenders, consumers, and the courts and contravene the purpose of § 1635 to make “[t]he rescission process * * * private, with the creditor and debtor working out the logistics of a given rescission.” *McKenna*, 475 F.3d at 421; *accord Belini*, 412 F.3d at 25.

C. *Beach* does not require consumers to file suit within the three-year period provided under § 1635(f).

Relying on the Supreme Court’s decision in *Beach v. Owen Federal Bank* and this Court’s unpublished opinion in *Williams*, the district court characterized § 1635(f) as a

“statute of repose” requiring that consumers both notify their lender of their rescission and sue their lenders within three years. Dkt. 74 at 7-8 (citing *Williams*, 410 Fed. Appx. at 499). *Williams* correctly recognized that § 1635(f) has features of a statute of repose, because the three-year period described in that section runs from a fixed date—loan consummation—that is independent of the actions or inaction of the litigants. 410 Fed. App’x. at 498-99. But *Williams* erroneously assumed that, because § 1635(f) is much like a statute of repose, its three-year period also must establish the timeframe for initiating litigation. There is no rule that statutes of repose can be satisfied only by filing lawsuits, and *Beach* should not be read to require that result.

Beach involved a consumer who attempted to rescind a loan by raising rescission “as an affirmative defense in a collection action brought by the lender more than three years after the consummation of the transaction.” 523 U.S. at 411-12. The Court concluded that the language of § 1635(f) “takes us beyond any question whether it limits more than the time for bringing a suit, by governing the life of the underlying right as well.” *Id.* at 417. Because § 1635(f) “completely extinguishes the right of rescission at the end of the three-year period,” the consumer in *Beach* was not entitled to assert it for the first time more than three years after loan consummation as a defense to a foreclosure action. *Id.* at 411-12.

The holding in *Beach* clarifies *when* consumers must rescind their loans: “Section 1635 completely extinguishes the right of rescission at the end of the 3-year period.” *Id.* at 412. But it does not address *how* consumers must do so. Accordingly, the lower

courts have recognized that *Beach* does not resolve the question presented here: whether § 1635(f) requires consumers to file suit before the right to rescind expires. *Bradford*, 799 F. Supp. 2d at 629-30; *Rosenfield v. HSBC Bank, USA*, No. 10-cv-00058, 2010 WL 3489926, *5 (D. Colo. Aug. 31, 2010).

Many courts, including this Court in *Williams*, nevertheless have relied on *Beach* to hold that § 1635(f) is a “statute of repose” that requires consumers to file suit within the three-year period. 410 Fed. App’x at 499; *see also McOmie-Gray*, 667 F.3d at 1328-29. The first half of that analysis is unobjectionable. These courts correctly perceive that § 1635(f) is much like a statute of repose, because it measures the time within which consumers must exercise their right to rescind from “a fixed date readily determinable by the [lender],” *Sterlin v. Biomune Sys.*, 154 F.3d 1191, 1196 n.9 (10th Cir. 1998)—the date of the relevant credit transaction—rather than from the (possibly indeterminate) date when consumers learn that they did not receive required disclosures. *Beach* thus acknowledges that TILA “permits no federal right to rescind, defensively or otherwise, after the 3-year period of § 1635(f) has run,” even if consumers do not learn that their lender failed to provide the required disclosures until after the three-year period has passed. 523 U.S. at 419.

But concluding that the label “statute of repose” implicitly requires the filing of a lawsuit within three years, *Williams*, 410 Fed. App’x. at 499; *McOmie-Gray*, 667 F.3d at 1326, mistakenly expands the holding in *Beach*. There is no rule that statutes of repose can be satisfied only by filing lawsuits. On the contrary, statutes of repose are

frequently used to limit the time for taking other types of actions, such as sending notices or submitting claims for benefits. The Uniform Commercial Code, for example, contains a “statute of repose” pursuant to which consumers must “notif[y] the bank of [their] objection” to an unauthorized wire transfer from their account “within one year of receiving notice of the account’s debit.” *Ma v. Merrill Lynch*, 597 F.3d 84, 88-89 (2d Cir. 2010) (discussing N.Y. UCC § 4-A-505). Other statutes that have been identified as “statutes of repose” require applicants for immigration relief or public benefits to submit applications within a defined period of time. *See, e.g., Balam-Chuc v. Mukasey*, 547 F.3d 1044, 1048-50 (9th Cir. 2008); *Iacono v. Office of Persl. Mgmt.*, 974 F.2d 1326, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 1992). These statutes provide repose by establishing a date certain for applicants to obtain relief by taking the act specified in statute, but they do not require filing lawsuits.

Of course, applicants claiming relief under these statutes may resort to litigation: The government might reject a claim for benefits as untimely, or a bank might refuse to refund a wire transfer by claiming its customer failed to give proper notice. *See, e.g., Regatos v. N. Fork Bank*, 257 F. Supp. 2d 632, 642-45 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). But the statute of repose in such a case defines the time for taking the act specified in the statute, not the time for filing any ensuing litigation. *See Zengen, Inc. v. Comerica Bank*, 158 P.3d 800, 811 (Cal. 2007) (statute regarding unauthorized wire transfers was “not a statute of limitation but merely a statute of repose. It requires the customer only to notify the bank of the claim, not actually to commence the action.”) (citation

omitted); *Grabowski v. Bank of Boston*, 997 F. Supp. 111, 119 (D. Mass. 1997) (a similar provision was “in the nature of a statute of repose” and “does not create a statute of limitations on the time allowed to bring suit under [the statute]. Instead, it creates a one year notice requirement.”) (citation omitted).

When Congress intends to use a statute of repose to define the period of time for filing lawsuits, it does so unambiguously. The Securities Exchange Act of 1934, for example, refers expressly to litigation in providing a “3-year period of repose”: “*No action shall be maintained to enforce any liability created under this section, unless brought within one year after the discovery of the facts constituting the violation and within three years after such violation.*” *Lampf, Pleva, Lipkind, Prupis & Petigrow v. Gilbertson*, 501 U.S. 350, 360 & n.6 (1991) (quoting 15 U.S.C. § 78i(e)) (emphasis added). The General Aviation Revitalization Act of 1994 similarly provides an “eighteen-year statute of repose” that forbids “*civil action[s] for damages * * ** after the applicable limitation period[.]” *Blaževska v. Raytheon Aircraft Co.*, 522 F.3d 948, 950-51 (9th Cir. 2008) (quoting Pub. L. No. 103-298, 108 Stat. 1552) (emphasis added). Likewise, “[s]ection 413 of ERISA is a statute of repose” providing that “[*n*]o action may be commenced” six years from the date of an alleged breach of fiduciary duty. *Radford v. Gen. Dynamics Corp.*, 151 F.3d 396, 399-400 (5th Cir. 1998) (quoting 29 U.S.C. § 1113) (emphasis added). The lack of comparable language in § 1635(f) is further evidence that this section should not be interpreted to require the filing of a lawsuit.

See Atl. Sounding Co., Inc. v. Townsend, 557 U.S. 404, 129 S. Ct. 2561, 2570 (2009); *Omni Capital Int'l, Ltd. v. Rudolf Wolff & Co.*, 484 U.S. 97, 106 (1987).

The understanding that § 1635(f) may be satisfied through notification rather than litigation does not permit tolling or thwart “the strong public policy favoring certainty of title,” as some courts have assumed. *See, e.g., Sobieniak v. BAC Home Loans Serv., LP*, 2011 WL 6122318 at *4 (D. Minn. Dec. 8, 2011), *appeal docketed*, No. 12-1053 (8th Cir. Jan. 9, 2012). Even if it did, it is not for the courts “to substitute [their] view of * * * policy for the legislation which has been passed by Congress.” *Florida Dept. of Revenue v. Piccadilly Cafeterias, Inc.*, 554 U.S. 33, 52 (2008). But achieving rescission through notice does not allow tolling and helps ensure certainty of title more promptly than many courts have assumed. TILA requires consumers to notify their lenders of their rescission within a specified, non-tollable time period. *See* 15 U.S.C. §§ 1635(a), (f). By definition, a lender must be placed on notice of a consumer’s rescission within three years of loan consummation or the right is forever extinguished.

If the lender disputes the consumer’s right to rescind, it typically has two options: it can file suit to confirm the consumer does not have a right to rescind, or it can choose not to sue and risk that a court will resolve that issue in the consumer’s

favor in a later proceeding. But the promptness of litigation to determine the validity of the consumer's rescission is within the lender's control.⁶

Indeed, a similar sequence of events was alleged to have unfolded in the proceedings below. The Sherzers received their loans from Homestar and HSBC in August 2004, and notified Homestar and HSBC of their rescission in May 2007. Homestar and HSBC promptly reviewed the loan file, determined that they did not agree that they had violated TILA at least as to one of their two loans, and declined to take the steps set forth in § 1635(b) with respect to that loan. Within six months, and before any sale of the home, the Sherzers filed suit to require Homestar and HSBC to honor their rescission.

If, as Homestar and HSBC did here, the lender chooses not to file suit, it assumes the risk of a later adverse determination and has little cause to complain about protracted uncertainty regarding the validity of its security interest. The Act protects lenders' interests by requiring consumers to provide notice of the rescission

⁶ Consumers can also sue to confirm that they previously rescinded and to compel lenders to comply with the procedures set forth in § 1635(b). *See supra* 16-19. The fact that § 1635 does not expressly limit the time period for such lawsuits does not mean no limit exists. Some courts have concluded that TILA's general one-year statute of limitations, 15 U.S.C. § 1640, applies. *See, e.g., Hunter*, 400 B.R. at 660-61. There is some support for this approach in the legislative history. *See* S. REP. NO. 96-368, at 32 (1979), *reprinted in* 1980 U.S.C.C.A.N. 236, 268. Other courts have found § 1640 inapplicable. *See, e.g., McOmie*, 667 F.3d at 1327-28. If § 1640 does not apply, courts may apply well-established borrowing doctrines to find an analogous statute of limitations. *See, e.g., Graham Cnty. Soil & Water Conservation Dist. v. United States ex rel. Wilson*, 545 U.S. 409, 414-15 (2005).

within three years of obtaining their loans. The Act should not be interpreted to penalize consumers for rescinding by providing notice in accordance with the plain language of the statute, particularly given that § 1635 is designed to permit consumers to rescind without judicial intervention, and that the Act is “a remedial consumer protection statute” that “should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer.” *Rossman v. Fleet Bank (R.I.) Nat. Ass’n*, 280 F.3d 384, 390 (3d Cir. 2002).

* * *

In sum, § 1635 is a straightforward provision that permits consumers who do not receive the necessary disclosures to rescind qualifying mortgage loans by notifying their lender within three years of obtaining the loan. This Court should reject a construction of § 1635 that also would require consumers to file suit against their lenders within the same three-year timeframe: It is not supported by the plain language of the provision and contravenes the purpose of the statutory scheme to provide consumers a private, non-judicial mechanism to rescind mortgage loans.

CONCLUSION

The decision below should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted.

s/ Peter G. Wilson _____

LEONARD J. KENNEDY

General Counsel

TO-QUYEN TRUONG

Deputy General Counsel

DAVID M. GOSSETT

Assistant General Counsel

RACHEL RODMAN

Senior Counsel

PETER G. WILSON

KRISTIN BATEMAN

Attorneys

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

1700 G Street, NW

Washington, D.C. 20552

(202) 435-7585

peter.wilson@cfpb.gov

April 13, 2012

Counsel for *Amicus Curiae*

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 32(A)(7)

I certify that this brief complies with the type-volume limitation set forth in FRAP 32(a)(7)(B). My word processing program, Microsoft Word, counted 6,984 words in the foregoing brief, exclusive of the portions excluded by Rule 32(a)(7)(B)(iii).

April 13, 2012

s/ Peter G. Wilson
Peter G. Wilson
Attorney for *Amicus Curiae*
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
1700 G Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20552
peter.wilson@cfpb.gov
(202) 435-7585

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 13, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing using the court's CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Matthew B. Weisberg, Esq.
WEISBERG LAW
7 South Morton Avenue
Morton, PA 19070-0000
Counsel for plaintiffs-appellants

Edmund D. Krulewicz
Kellie A. Lavery
REED SMITH LLP
136 Main Street
Suite 250, Princeton Forrestal Village
Princeton, NJ 08540
Counsel for defendants-appellees Homestar Mortgage Services and HSBC Bank USA

Joe N. Nguyen
Nipun J. Patel
Henry F. Reichner
REED SMITH LLP
1650 Market Street
2500 One Liberty Place
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7301
Counsel for defendants-appellees Homestar Mortgage Services and HSBC Bank USA

April 13, 2012

s/ Peter G. Wilson
Peter G. Wilson
Attorney for *Amicus Curiae*
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
1700 G Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20552
peter.wilson@cfpb.gov
(202) 435-7585