## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,	) ) )	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action No. 18-CV-5587
v.	)	Hon. Manish S. Shah
EQUITYBUILD, INC., et al.,	)	
Defendants.	) ) )	

#### SEC'S RESPONSE TO DLP's GROUP 2 POSITION STATEMENT

The SEC's Position Statement (ECF 1556) showed that the MLK Property involves the same facts and law the Court addressed in Group 1 to find the defrauded investors have priority. The SEC's position is consistent with those of the defrauded investors (ECF 1561, 1566-1, 1566-2) as well as the Receiver (ECF 1571). As in Group 1, the only claimant taking a contrary view is a single institutional lender, DLP. (ECF 1559).

DLP's Position Statement provides no legitimate reason for the Court to deviate from its Group 1 legal analysis. Instead, DLP simply ignores the Court's Group 1 Opinion, makes no attempt to distinguish it, and repeats arguments the Court has squarely rejected. And the limited evidence and cases DLP does cite offer no support for the argument that Equitybuild Finance had the authority to release the investors' mortgage.

Given that the facts are not in dispute, the Court should apply the same law as in Group 1 to reach the same result: The victimized investors, who obtained a prior-in-time mortgage and never authorized its release, have priority.

## 1. DLP Ignores the Court's Group 1 Opinion, and Cannot Differentiate It.

DLP fails to acknowledge the Court's Group 1 holding, and makes no effort to distinguish it. DLP's inability to do so, in the first instance, shows the investors should have priority.

Indeed, DLP's lone reference to Group 1 is to describe its facts in a manner the Court expressly rejected. To that end, DLP's only citation to Group 1 brazenly claims that Group 1's releases contained a "scrivener's error." (ECF 1559 at 4 n.1). But the Court reached the exact opposition conclusion. *See* ECF 1386 at 13 ("BC57 has not proven a scrivener's error"). In any event, as noted previously, the "facial defect" in Group 1's releases was only one of three independent grounds on which the Court based its priority determination. *See* ECF 1556 at 5-6 (citing ECF 1386 at 12-29).

As for the remaining two independent grounds supporting the Court's ruling – "improper signatory" and lack of authorization – DLP does not identify *any* difference between the MLK Property documents and those at issue in Group 1. Rather, DLP concedes the MLK release was executed by Equitybuild Finance, as opposed to the investors listed as the lenders on the MLK mortgage. *See* ECF 1559 at 3-4, 1559-1 at 3, 1559-2 at 3. The Court has already ruled that a release executed by an "improper signatory" does not satisfy the requirements of the Illinois Mortgage Act. ECF 1386 at 13-14. DLP offers no evidence or authority for reaching a different conclusion here.

Similarly, DLP cites the exact same CAS Agreements the Court scrutinized in Group 1, stubbornly claiming those agreements gave Equitybuild Finance "actual authority to execute the [MLK Property] Release." ECF 1559 at 4 n.2. DLP does so without citing any legal authority. Worse, DLP ignores that the Court rejected this argument for Group 1. There, the Court found

the CAS Agreements bestowed no such authority and, instead, "explicitly barred Equitybuild Finance from unilaterally releasing the mortgages." ECF 1386 at 15-24. DLP provides no valid argument or new evidence for the Court to revisit this determination.

# 2. The Evidence and Law DLP Cites Do Not Establish Its Priority.

According to DLP, it "reasonably relied on EBF's apparent authority to release the [MLK Property] Mortgage." ECF 1559 at 4. DLP thus advises that a finding of apparent authority "focuses exclusively" on the "words or conduct" of the *principal*, as opposed to the agent. *Id.* at 4 (citing *Weil, Freiburg & Thomas, P.C. v. Sara Lee Corp.*, 218 Ill. App. 3d 383, 390 (1st Dist. 1991)). Despite averring that the principal's conduct is determinative, the only evidence DLP offers to show its belief of authority are documents from Equitybuild Finance, not the investor-principals. Namely, the primary documents DLP cites for its "apparent authority" argument are the MLK Property mortgage and release. *See* ECF 1559 at 4-5. But those two documents were each prepared and recorded by Equitybuild Finance, not the investors. *See* ECF 1559-1 at 4, 1559-2 at 2-3. And neither document contains any statement, representation, or confirmation by the *investors* that they authorized Equitybuild Finance to release their mortgage.

Similarly, the remaining three documents DLP claims establish its apparent authority come from third parties who were neither the agent nor principal. One is an opinion letter from an attorney for Jerry Cohen and certain Equitybuild affiliates. ECF 1559-6. Again, that letter contains no evidence showing the investors authorized their mortgage's release. *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The *only* evidence DLP cites reflecting the "words or conduct" or the investor-principals are the CAS Agreements. ECF 1559 at 4 n.2. As discussed above, the Court already held those agreements did not bestow authority to release the investors' mortgage. Moreover, because DLP never saw (or bothered to ask for) the CAS Agreements, those agreements could not provide DLP "knowledge of the facts and [a] good-faith belief that the agent possessed such authority." *Id.* at 4 (quoting *Weil, Freiburg*, 218 Ill. App. 3d at 390).

The other two documents, a title insurance policy and commitment letter, are both from DLP's own *title insurance company*. See ECF 1559-4 and 1559-5. These third-party documents likewise contain no representations from the investors suggesting Equitybuild Finance had authority to release their mortgage. *Id.* And, to the extent DLP claims these insurance documents supported the reasonableness of its conduct or otherwise warrant a finding of priority, the Court has already rejected that argument. See ECF 1386 at 27. ("A 'title insurer is not in the business of supplying information when it issues a title commitment or a policy of title insurance,' so BC57 could not rely on the title insurer...") (citations omitted).

## 3. The Cook County Order DLP Cites Does Not Change the Outcome.

Unable to distinguish the facts of the MLK Property from the facts of Group 1, DLP emphasizes a Cook County Circuit Court order involving a former Equitybuild property that was sold before the SEC commenced this action and was not part of the Receivership. ECF 1559 at 5 (citing 5201 Wash. Investors LLC v. Equitybuild, Inc., 2023 Ill. Cir. LEXIS 79 (Cook Cty. Cir. Ct. May 18, 2023)). That order is presently on appeal. See attached Exhibit 1 (Docket Report). Tellingly, BC57 is represented by the same attorneys as DLP, yet did not cite the order in its appeal of the Group 1 Opinion. See SEC v. Equitybuild, Inc., 7th Cir. No. 23-1870, Docs. 7 (BC57 opening brief) (Jun. 14, 2023) and 51 (BC57 reply) (Sept. 15, 2023).

As an initial matter, 5201 Wash. was decided on a motion to dismiss an investor's declaratory judgment action. 2023 Ill. Cir. LEXIS 79 at \*1. Thus, the county court did not have the benefit of the extensive discovery record, deep familiarity with the case, and perspective from the SEC and Receiver that this Court did when deciding Group 1. Moreover, briefing on the motion to dismiss was completed before this Court issued its Group 1 opinion. See Ex. 1. So

the county court apparently did not consider this Court's Group 1 Opinion, and did not attempt to differentiate the Opinion in its order.

As for the substance of the order, the 5021 Wash. movants were not parties that purchased the property from Equitybuild. Rather, they were three downstream purchasers who sequentially obtained title to the property from the party that had bought it from Equitybuild.

2023 Ill. Cir. LEXIS 79 at \*\*2-4. Thus, unlike BC57 in Group 1 or DLP here, the movants were not afforded the opportunity to conduct due diligence or otherwise gain insight into Equitybuild's business or investors. Critically, the movants premised their motion, and the court granted it, based on movants' claims of being bona fide purchasers. Id. at \*\*6-7, 15-16. That holding should have no bearing on the MLK Property, given that DLP does not even assert bona fide purchaser status in its Position Statement.<sup>2</sup>

Further distinguishing itself from Group 1 or the MLK Property, the 5201 Wash. court determined that the "recorded mortgage identifies on its face that the Investors designated EBF as their authorized agent." 2023 Ill. Cir. LEXIS 79 at \*13 (emphasis added). But a review of the MLK Property mortgage shows that nowhere does it identify Equitybuild Finance as the investors' agent (and certainly not an agent authorized to release the mortgage). See ECF 1559-1. Rather, the MLK Mortgage merely identifies Equitybuild Finance being in a "C/O" relationship with the investors. Id. The 5201 Wash. court further read the release as being

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The *5201 Wash*. court made its *bona fide* purchaser finding because "Plaintiffs fail to allege or establish any facts discovered during in the Defendants due diligence that would have caused the Defendants to doubt the validity of the title search, which found that the Investor Mortgage had been expressly released of record." 2023 Ill. Cir. LEXIS 79, at \*15. Conversely, here the Receiver alleges numerous facts, backed by evidence, supporting its claim that DLP was on inquiry notice when it purchased the MLK Property from Equitybuild. ECF 1537 at 12-17. Similarly, *5201 Wash*. did not involve key discrepancies among four mortgage-related documents, which the SEC identified to be the case for the MLK Property. *See* ECF 1556 at 4.

"executed by 'EquityBuild Finance, LLC as agent for the persons listed on the investor

mortgage.[']" Id. (emphasis added). On the other hand, the MLK Property release does not

identify Equitybuild Finance acting as the investors' agent. ECF 1559-2. In fact, the release

doesn't reference the investors whatsoever. Id.

In short, the Cook County 5201 Wash. order involved a different procedural posture,

different facts, and different legal theories to the MLK Property. And it was decided without

reference to this Court's Group 1 ruling and is currently being appealed. Accordingly, the Court

should not find the order as a basis for deviating from its Group 1 rulings or to rule against the

investors.

4. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons and those stated in its Group 2 Position Statement, the SEC

respectfully requests that the Court find the MLK Property investors who obtained a valid prior-

in-time mortgage, who never authorized the fraudulent release of their mortgage, and who never

received payment in connection with such release, have priority and are entitled to a distribution

of the proceeds of the property's sale.

Dated: January 10, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Benjamin Hanauer

Benjamin J. Hanauer (hanauerb@sec.gov) 175 West Jackson Blvd., Suite 1450

Chicago, IL 60604

Phone: (312) 353-7390

Facsimile: (312) 353-7398

Attorney for Plaintiff

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

6

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I provided service of the foregoing Response, via ECF filing, to all counsel of record and Defendant Shaun Cohen, and to all claimants via the Receiver's email distribution list, on January 10, 2024.

/s/ Benjamin Hanauer

Benjamin J. Hanauer 175 West Jackson Blvd., Suite 1450 Chicago, IL 60604

Phone: (312) 353-7390 Facsimile: (312) 353-7398

One of the Attorneys for Plaintiff

# Civil, Law, Chancery, Domestic Case Search

For your convenience, the Clerk of the Circuit Court offers on-line access to electronic docket information for cases in the Criminal divisions. By using this service, the user agrees and understands that he or she is bound by the online access to court records Terms of Agreement.

Case Information for Case Number: 2022CH01268

Search Again

Case Number	Calendar	Date Filed	Division		
2022CH01268	CHCAL59	02/15/2022	District 1		
Plaintiff(s)		Case Type		Defendant(s)	Attorney
5201 WASHING INVEST LLC ARTHUR BERTI		Commercial, Mix Commercial/Res Industrial		EQUITYBUILD, INC. PP FIN CHICAGO 36 LLC GREYSTONE SERVICING CORP., INC. FANNIE MAE	AUGENLICHT ROBERT JOHN KURTZ AUGENLICHT LLP WILLIAM MCKENNA DANIEL RAYMOND
Ad Damnum					
0					

**Future Court Activity:** 

Case Activities:

**Activity** 10/11/2023 Date:

**Event** Placita And Cert Of

Comments: Desc: Transcript Of Record For

Appeal Filed

**Activity** 08/09/2023 **Event** Notice Of Filing Filed Comments: Notice of Filing of Date: Plaintiff/Appellant's Desc: Request for Preparation of Record on Appeal **Activity** 08/09/2023 **Event** Request For Preparation **Comments:** Request for Preparation Desc: Of Record Date: of Record on Appeal **Activity** 08/08/2023 Event Notice Of Filing Filed Comments: Notice of Filing Notice of Date: Desc: Appeal Notice of Appeal from **Activity** 08/04/2023 **Event** Notice Of Appeal Filed Comments: Rule 304(a) Order Date: Desc: entered 14 July 2023 Event Motion To - Allowed -Comments: **Activity** 07/14/2023 Date: Desc: **Activity** 05/18/2023 **Event** Courts Motion This Case Comments: Date: Desc: Is Taken Under Advisement **Activity** 05/18/2023 Event Dismiss, Strike Or Comments: Date: Desc: Withdraw A Specific Defendant - Allowed -**Activity** 04/12/2023 Event Continuance - Allowed -Comments: Date: Desc:

**Activity** 04/12/2023 Event Strike From The Call -Comments: The hearing date of April 20, 2023 is stricken. Date: Desc: Allowed -**Activity** 04/12/2023 **Event** Case Assigned to Zoom Comments: Date: Desc: Hearing - Allowed Event Continuance - Allowed -**Activity** 02/10/2023 **Comments:** Date: Desc: **Activity** 02/10/2023 **Event** Case Assigned to Zoom Comments: Date: Desc: Hearing - Allowed **Activity** 12/27/2022 **Event** Notice Of Filing Filed Comments: Notice of Filing Plaintiffs' Date: Response to Brief of Desc: Amicus Curiae **Activity** 12/27/2022 **Event** Memorandum Filed **Comments:** Plaintiffs Response to Date: Desc: **Brief of Amicus Curiae** Federal Housing Finance Agency **Activity** 12/12/2022 **Event** File Appearance Or Jury **Comments:** Date: **Desc:** Demand, Answer Or Plead - Allowed -

**Activity** 12/12/2022

Date:

**Event** Amend Order Or Decree **Comments**:

Desc: - Allowed -

Comments:

**Activity** 12/12/2022

Date:

**Event** Agreed Order Entered

Desc:

**Activity** 12/12/2022

Date:

**Event** Order Or Judgment

**Desc:** Entered-Nunc Pro Tunc

Comments:

**Activity** 11/15/2022

Date:

**Event** Notice Of Filing Filed

Desc:

Comments: NOTICE OF FILING

**Activity** 11/15/2022

Date:

**Event** Brief Filed

Desc:

**Comments:** BRIEF OF AMICUS

**CURIAE FEDERAL** HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS FEDERAL NATIONAL

MORTGAGE

**ASSOCIATION AND** 

**GREYSTONE** 

SERVICING COMPANY LLCS MOTION TO

DISMISS THE **PLAINTIFFS** 

**COMPLAINT UNDER** SECTION 2-619 OF THE ILLINOIS CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

AND 12 U.S.C. 4617

**Activity** 10/18/2022

Date:

**Event** Answer/Reply/Response

Desc: - Allowed

**Comments:** 

**Activity** 10/18/2022 **Event** File Appearance Or Jury **Comments: Desc:** Demand, Answer Or Date: Plead - Allowed -Event Motion To - Denied -Comments: **Activity** 10/18/2022 Date: Desc: **Activity** 09/29/2022 **Event** Strike From Case Comments: Date: Desc: Management Call -Allowed **Activity** 09/28/2022 **Event** Answer/Response/Reply Comments: Reply in Support of Date: Desc: FHFA's Motion for Leave to Participate in Oral Argument as Amicus Curiae **Activity** 09/28/2022 **Event** Notice Of Filing Filed Comments: Notice of Filing Date: Desc: **Activity** 09/27/2022 **Event** Notice Of Filing Filed Comments: NOTICE OF FILING Date: Desc:

**Activity** 09/27/2022 **Event** Answer/Response/Reply Comments: FEDERAL HOUSING Date: Desc: FINANCE AGENCY'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR **LEAVE TO** PARTICIPATE IN ORAL **ARGUMENT AS** AMICUS CURIAE **Activity** 09/26/2022 **Event** Notice Of Motion Filed Comments: Amended Notice of Date: Desc: Motion **Activity** 09/23/2022 **Event** Notice Of Filing Filed Comments: Notice of Filing of Date: Desc: Plaintiff's Response to Federal Housing Finance Authority's Motion to Participate as Amicus Curiae **Activity** 09/23/2022 **Event** Answer/Response/Reply Comments: Plaintiff's Response to Date: Motion of Federal Desc: Housing Finance Authority to Participate as Amicus Curiae

**Event** Notice Of Motion Filed

Desc:

**Activity** 09/14/2022

Date:

Comments: NOTICE OF MOTION

**Event** Motion Filed **Activity** 09/14/2022 Comments: FEDERAL HOUSING Date: FINANCE AGENCY'S Desc: MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PARTICIPATE IN ORAL ARGUMENT AS AMICUS CURIAE **Activity** 09/14/2022 **Event** Appearance Filed - No Comments: Additional Appearance Date: **Desc:** Fee Paid - (Jury by Out-of-State Attorney per Rule 707 Demand) **Event** Notice Filed Comments: Verified Statement of **Activity** 09/14/2022 Date: Desc: **Out-of-State Attorney** Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 707 **Activity** 09/14/2022 Event Appearance Filed - Fee Comments: Initial Appearance on **Desc:** Paid - (Jury Demand) behalf of Proposed Date: Amicus Curiae Federal Housing Finance Agency Event Continuance - Allowed -**Comments: Activity** 09/09/2022 Date: Desc: **Activity** 09/09/2022 **Event** Case Assigned to Zoom Comments: Date: Desc: Hearing - Allowed **Activity** 08/26/2022 **Event** Answer/Response/Reply Comments: PP FIN Chicago 36 LLC's Reply In Support Date: Desc:

of Motion to Dismiss

Activity Date:	08/26/2022	Event Desc:	Answer/Response/Reply	Comments:	
Activity Date:	08/26/2022	Event Desc:	Notice Of Filing Filed	Comments:	
Activity Date:	08/26/2022	Event Desc:	Notice Of Filing Filed	Comments:	
Activity Date:	08/19/2022	Event Desc:	Electronic Notice Sent	Comments:	
Activity Date:	08/19/2022	Event Desc:	Electronic Notice Sent	Comments:	
Activity Date:	07/29/2022	Event Desc:	Notice Of Motion Filed	Comments:	Notice of Motion to Exceed Page Limit
Activity Date:	07/29/2022	Event Desc:	Motion Filed	Comments:	Motion to Exceed Page Limit
Activity Date:	07/29/2022	Event Desc:	Notice Of Filing Filed	Comments:	Notice of Filing of Plaintiffs Responses to Defendants Motions to Dismiss

**Activity** 07/29/2022 Event Answer/Response/Reply Comments: Plaintiffs' Response to Date: Desc: Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendants **GREYSTONE** SERVICING and **FANNIE MAE** with exhibits Comments: Plaintiffs' Response to **Activity** 07/29/2022 **Event** Answer/Response/Reply Date: Desc: Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendant PP FIN CHICAGO 36 LLC with exhibits **Activity** 07/18/2022 **Event** Case Continued For Comments: Date: **Desc:** Case Management Conference-Allowed **Activity** 07/18/2022 **Event** Courtesy Copies Comments: Desc: Required - Allowed Date: **Activity** 07/18/2022 **Event** Withdrawal Of Attorney Comments: Desc: From Case - Allowed -Date: **Activity** 07/18/2022 **Event** Case Assigned to Zoom Comments: Date: Desc: Hearing - Allowed

**Activity** 07/18/2022

Date:

**Event** Strike From The Call -

Desc: Allowed -

**Comments:** The case management date of August 23, 2022

is stricken.

**Activity** 07/18/2022

Date:

Event Set Briefing Schedule -

Desc: Allowed -

Comments:

**Activity** 07/18/2022

Date:

**Event** Agreed Order Entered

Desc:

**Comments:** 

**Activity** 07/18/2022

Date:

**Event** Substitute Or Add

Desc: Attorney - Allowed -

Comments:

**Activity** 07/13/2022

Date:

**Event** Electronic Notice Sent

Desc:

**Comments:** 

**Activity** 07/13/2022

Date:

**Event** Electronic Notice Sent

Desc:

Comments:

**Activity** 07/13/2022

Date:

**Event** Electronic Notice Sent

Desc:

Comments:

**Activity** 07/13/2022

Date:

**Event** Electronic Notice Sent Desc:

Comments:

**Activity** 07/11/2022

Date:

**Event** Agreed Order Entered

Desc:

Comments:

**Activity** 07/11/2022

Date:

Event Set Briefing Schedule -

Desc: Allowed -

Comments:

**Activity** 07/11/2022

Date:

**Event** Strike From The Call -

Desc: Allowed -

Comments: The case management

date of August 23, 2022

is stricken.

**Activity** 07/11/2022

Date:

**Event** Substitute Or Add

Desc: Attorney - Allowed -

Comments:

**Activity** 07/11/2022

Date:

**Event** Withdrawal Of Attorney

Desc: From Case - Allowed -

Comments:

**Activity** 07/11/2022

Date:

**Event** Case Continued For

Desc: Case Management

Conference-Allowed

Comments:

**Activity** 07/11/2022

Date:

**Event** Case Assigned to Zoom

Desc: Hearing - Allowed

Comments:

**Activity** 07/08/2022

Date:

**Event** Notice Of Filing Filed

Desc:

Comments: Notice of Filing of

Stipulation to Substitute

**Activity** 07/08/2022

Date:

**Event** Substitution Of Attorney

Desc: Filed

Comments: Stipulation and

Substitution of Attorney

for Plaintiff 5201 Washington Investors

LLC

**Activity** 06/09/2022

Date:

**Event** Strike From The Call -

Desc: Allowed -

Comments: The presentment date of

June 23,2022 is stricken.

**Activity** 06/09/2022

Date:

**Event** Agreed Order Entered

Desc:

Comments:

**Activity** 06/09/2022

Date:

**Event** Answer/Reply/Response

Desc: - Allowed

**Comments:** 

**Activity** 06/09/2022

Date:

Event Strike From The Call -

Desc: Allowed -

Comments: The presentment date of

June 16, 2022 is

stricken.

**Activity** 06/09/2022

Date:

**Event** Case Assigned to Zoom

Desc: Hearing - Allowed

Comments:

**Activity** 06/09/2022

Date:

**Event** Case Set On Status Call Comments:

Desc:

**Activity** 06/09/2022

Date:

Event Strike From The Call -

Desc: Allowed -

**Comments:** The case management date of August 15, 2022

is stricken and reset.

**Activity** 06/09/2022 Event Answer/Reply/Response Comments: Date: Desc: - Allowed **Event** Notice Of Motion Filed Comments: **Activity** 06/03/2022 Date: Desc: **Activity** 06/03/2022 **Event** Notice Of Motion Filed Comments: Notice of Defendants' Date: Desc: Fannie Mae & Greystone Servicing Co., LLC's 2-619 Motion to Dismiss Complaint **Activity** 06/03/2022 **Event** Exhibits Filed **Comments:** Exhibits to Memorandum Date: Desc: In Support of Defendants' Fannie Mae & Greystone Servicing Co., LLC's 2-619 Motion to Dismiss Complaint Activity 06/03/2022 **Event** Memorandum In Support **Comments**: Memorandum In Support Desc: Of Motion Filed Date: of Defendants' Fannie Mae & Greystone Servicing Co., LLC's 2-619 Motion to Dismiss Complaint **Activity** 06/03/2022 **Event** Motion To Dismiss Filed Comments: Defendants' Fannie Mae & Greystone Servicing Date: Desc: Co., LLC's 2-619 Motion to Dismiss Complaint

Activity Date:	06/03/2022	Event Desc:	Motion To Dismiss Filed	Comments:	
Activity Date:	06/03/2022	Event Desc:	Notice Of Motion Filed	Comments:	
Activity Date:	06/03/2022	Event Desc:	Motion To Dismiss Filed	Comments:	
Activity Date:	05/12/2022	Event Desc:	Assign To Judge Within Division	Comments:	
Activity Date:	04/06/2022	Event Desc:	Appearance Filed - Fee Paid -	Comments:	
Activity Date:	04/06/2022	Event Desc:	Appearance Filed - Fee Paid -	Comments:	
Activity Date:	04/06/2022	Event Desc:	Appearance Filed - Fee Paid -	Comments:	Appearance- Shelley Smith
Activity Date:	04/05/2022		SOJ (As of Right) - Allowed	Comments:	

**Activity** 04/05/2022

Date:

**Event** File Appearance Or Jury

**Desc:** Demand, Answer Or Plead - Allowed -

**Comments:** 

**Activity** 04/05/2022

Date:

Event Motion To - Allowed -

Desc:

Comments:

**Activity** 03/08/2022

Date:

**Event** Notice Of Motion Filed

Desc:

Comments:

**Activity** 03/08/2022

Date:

**Event** Motion Filed

Desc:

**Comments:** 

**Activity** 03/08/2022

Date:

**Event** Summons Issued And

Desc: Returnable

Comments: Summons as to Fannie

Mae

**Activity** 03/08/2022

Date:

**Event** Summons Issued And

Desc: Returnable

Comments: Summons as to

Greystone Servicing

Corporation, Inc.

**Activity** 03/08/2022

Date:

**Event** Summons Issued And

**Desc:** Returnable

Comments: Summons as to PP FIN

Chicago 36 LLC

**Activity** 03/08/2022

Date:

**Event** Summons Issued And

Desc: Returnable

Comments: Summons as to

Equitybuild, Inc.

**Activity** 02/15/2022

**Event** Commercial, Mixed

**Comments:** 

Date:

**Desc:** Commercial/Residential

Or Industrial-Filed

**Activity** 02/15/2022

**Event** New Case Filing

Comments:

Date:

Desc:

Please Note: If data does not appear in a specific field, we likely do not have the responsive data in our master database. If you have reason to believe there is an error, please contact the Internet Court Call Help Line at 312.603.4357.