30 Week dienty A. Sour Bleis. 500 / 9 5 9 5 0 1 500 / 8145.

Case No. 78-3546

Dept. No. 5

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

. C. Sweerey

MARINE MIDLAND REALTY CREDIT CORPORATION

Plaintiff,

FINDINGS OF FACT CONCLUSIONS OF LAW JUDGMENT AND DECREE

vs.

JAMES F. TEMPLE, PHYLLIS TEMPLE, JEROME APELBY and FRANK W. COSTANZO

Defendants.

10

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

23

22

25

24

27

26

28 29

30

3132

The above entitled matter came on regularly for trial on the merits before the Court, sitting without a jury, on December 13-15, 1982. Representatives of both parties and their respective attorneys of record were present. Prior to trial, plaintiff Marine Midland Realty Credit Corporation ("Marine") entered into a settlement agreement with defendants James F. Temple, Phyllis Temple and Jerome Apelby. Oral and documentary evidence were adduced at trial. At the request of the Court, briefs and points and authorities were filed by the parties. After having heard and carefully considered the testimony of the witnesses and having reviewed the documentary evidence, the Court finds the following facts and states the following conclusions of law:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. On October 29, 1973, Dominion Mortgage and Realty
 Trust ("Dominion") entered into a loan commitment with Temple
 Village, Inc. ("Temple Village") requiring Dominion to loan Temple
 Village an amount not to exceed 2.1 million dollars for the
 development of a condominium project located in Washoe County,
 Nevada.
- 2. The project was to consist of two phases. Phase I was to consist of 40 units with a maximum loan of 1.2 million

8

13

14

16

17 18

> 19 20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28

30

29

32

31

Phase II was to consist of 42 units and its funding was dollars. contingent upon the sale of 80% of Phase I units.

- The money loaned to Temple Village was evidenced by a Construction Loan Agreement ("Loan Agreement"), a Promissory Note and Deed of Trust covering both Phase I and Phase II land.
- Each of the documents contained a provision that the instruments would be governed by the laws of the State of New York.
- Dominion is a Massachusetts business trust with its 5. principal place of business in New York.
- Temple Village is a closely held New York 6. corporation.
- The money loaned to Temple Village under the Loan Agreement was originally guaranteed by James Temple, Phyllis Temple and Jerome Apelby.
- The money loaned was disbursed in New York from New York bank accounts.
 - Marine is a New York corporation. 9.
- New York is the state with the most significant 10. contacts with the transactions at issue
- Dominion subsequently assigned all of its interests under the Promissory Note and Deed of Trust to Marine.
- In September of 1974, defendant Frank W. Costanzo 12. (Costanzo) entered into an agreement with James Temple for the purchase of 50% of the stock in Temple Village.
- On January 15, 1975, Costanzo executed a Guaranty Agreement ("Guaranty Agreement"; Exhibit V) in which he personally guaranteed the payment of the obligations of Temple Village.
- At the time the Guaranty Agreement was executed by Costanzo, the balance due Marine was 1.2 million dollars plus interest.

27

28

29

30

31

32

- 15. Like the other documents involved in this transaction, the Guaranty Agreement provided that it was to be governed and construed according to the laws of the State of New York.
- 16. Payment upon the Guaranty Agreement was to be made in New York.
- The Eighth Judicial District Court entered a declaratory judgment (Exhibit M) which provides that the documents involved in this transaction are to be governed and construed according to the laws of the State of New York.
- Costanzo, a certified public accountant and 18. experienced businessman, made a knowing and intelligent decision to execute the Guaranty Agreement.
- The Loan Agreement was amended on January 30, 1975 19. and July 30, 1975. All guarantors, including Costanzo, consented to these amendments.
- In July-August of 1977, Marine agreed to a recon-20. veyance of the Deed of Trust on Phase II property in return for the payment of \$150,000.00, which was applied to the outstanding indebtedness of the loan.
- The collateral was released for its fair market 21. value.
- 22. Costanzo was not prejudiced by the release of the collateral.
- Costanzo took active part in the negotiations 23. leading up to the settling of the price for the land in question and by the execution of a quit claim deed, made possible a transfer of title to James and Phyllis Temple.
- 24. Marine and James and Phyllis Temple did not enter into an agreement for a new loan in the amount of \$117,269.99 in July-August of 1977.
- 25. There was no oral agreement which extinguished any obligation of Temple Village under the Loan Agreement.

- 26. Ken Rawski and Robert Lennartz did not assure
 Costanzo that he would be released from his obligations under
 Guaranty Agreement.
- 27. There was no intent by Marine to release Costanzo from his obligations under the Guaranty Agreement.
- 28. As units in Phase II were sold, Marine partially reconveyed its first Deed of Trust in order to facilitate financing by its purchasers.
- 29. Marine took bank notes secured by Second Deeds of Trust. Marine has collected much of the money from these trust deeds and credited the collected amounts against the outstanding balance due on the loan.
- 30. Temple Village is in default under the Loan Agreement, as amended.
- 31. The amount due under the Loan Agreement is \$255,437.69.
- 32. Costanzo's right to the Second Deeds of Trust was contingent upon Marine's being paid in full on the loan.
- 33. The Guaranty Agreement provides for an award of attorney's fee incurred in any suit to enforce the Guaranty Agreement.
- 34. Marine is entitled to judgment in the amount of \$255,473.69 against defendant Costanzo under the guaranty agreement.
- 35. Marine is also entitled to the costs of suit, with interest from November 30, 1982, and reasonable attorneys' fees.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 36. Normally, the intent of contracting parties controls as to the choice of law.
- 37. The Guaranty Agreement should be governed and construed according to the laws of the State of New York.

Under the laws of the State of New York, a guarantor

38.

collateral.

39. Costanzo waived his right to discharge from the obligations under the Guaranty Agreement upon Marine's release of the collateral.

may waive his right to discharge upon a creditors release of

- 40. The waiver contained in the Guaranty Agreement is valid and enforceable.
- 41. A creditor is not obligated to exhaust the collateral securing a debt before seeking to collect from a guarantor.
- 42. The reconveyance of the collateral did not release Costanzo from his obligations under the Guaranty Agreement.
- 43. The one action rule (NRS 40.430) does not apply to defendant Costanzo under the facts of this case.
- 44. Costanzo was not discharged from his obligations under the Guaranty Agreement by a novation.
- 45. Costanzo was not discharged from his obligations under the Guaranty Agreement by assurances from Marine officers.

1983.

BCca

JUDGMENT AND DECREE

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED:

That plaintiff Marine Midland Realty Credit Corporation recover from defendant Frank W. Costanzo the principal sum of \$255,473.69; interest thereon at 12% computed from November 30, 1982; with costs of suit and reasonable attorney's fees in the amount of \$.72,353.02

DONE IN OPEN COURT this 29 day of December

William N. Forman

DISTRICT JUDGE

BV

NEIED COPY ch this certificate is nd carrect copy of the of record in my office. 12,1984 ar Second Judicial

and for the County of

Deputy.