JNOFFICIAL COPY

FRAUDULENT DOCUMENT OR INSTRUMENT NOTICE

RECORDER, Please Mail To:

Manuel Martinez c/o BPR Consulting 1858 W. Cermak Road Chicago, IL 60608-4304

Prepared By:

Mark Jeffers, BPR Consulting 1858 W. Cermak Road Chicago, IL 60608-4304



Doc#: 1315048012 Fee: \$42.00 RHSF1 ee:\$10.00 Affidavit Fee.

Karen A. Yarbrough

Cook County Recorder of Deeds Date: 05/30/2013 02:13 PM Pg. 1 of 3

Above Space for Recorder's Use thely

CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE OF DOCUMENTED FRAUD

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that Manuel Martinez ("Title Holder") of Chicago, Cook County, in Illinois hereby gives Constructive Notice pertaining to the acts of fraud performed and continued fraudulent acts being perpetrated related to the following described real estate ("Property") situated in Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, to wit:

LOT 41 AND THE SOUTH 15 FEET OF LOT 42 IN BLOCK 9 IN MASON'S SUBDIVISION OF THE EAST HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (EXCEPT PAIL ROAD) OF SECTION 23, TOWNSHIP 40 NORTH, RANGE 13, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERID. A.J., IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS. The Clark's

Real Estate Tax Identification Number(s): 13-23-116-020-0000,

Commonly Known As: 3840 North Central Park Avenue.

Perpetrating these fraudulent acts were/are individuals, corporations and/or agents including, yet not limited to:

Claiming to be "Lender": WORLD SAVINGS BANK, FSB

Claiming to be "Mortgagee": WORLD SAVINGS BANK, FSB

Claiming to be successor, trustee or "Assignee": WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.

Claiming to be "Selling Officer": THE JUDICIAL SALES CORPORATION

and their successors and/or assigns.

Furthermore, this Notice affirms that Title Holder is vested with fee simple absolute title to the Property.

1315048012 Page: 2 of 3

UNOFFICIAL COPY

Lender allegedly induced Manuel Martinez ("Mortgagor") into a debt allegedly evidenced by a promissory note ("Note"). Allegedly in connection with the Note, Mortgagee recorded a security instrument ("Mortgage") in Cook County, Illinois dated 12/18/2007 and recorded 12/28/2007 as Document No. 0736208017. The Mortgage purports to grant a security interest in the Property to Mortgagee. Assignee claimed Mortgagee's security interest, yet has failed to show evidence of such a claim in the public land records or the court records. Assignee filed a Complaint to Foreclose under the Mortgage, giving constructive notice thereof by recording a Lis Pendens in said county dated 10/4/2011 and recorded 10/17/2011 as Document No. 1129026005. As a result of fraud upon the court, the court entered a judgment of foreclosure against Mortgagor and appointed Selling Officer to sell the Property. Selling Officer scheduled a sale of the property to take place on 6/7/2013.

This Fraudulent Document or Instrument Notice shall serve as lawful and public notice to all interested parties that all of the transactions and documents described in the paragraph above were the proximate results of fraud perpetrated upon the Mortgagor. The Mortgage was and is a product of willful, wanton and misleading false representations of material facts made by Lender. All ensuing transactions and documents and the interests and estates created by such were the fruit of the tree of fraud.

Moreover, the fo eclosure action taken by Assignee appears to be an example of a continued culture of fraud and deceit that is still consuming the mortgage banking industry and that has escalated into the courtrooms of judicial foreclosure states throughout America. False-flagging corporations, trusts, national associations, etc., and their foreclosure mill attorneys inundate courthouses with incomplete, falsified and otherwise defective documents intending (and usually succeeding) to defraud the courts into unduly and unjustly converting title to property from the rightful owners.

The Mortgage purports to secure an alleged debt resulting from a loan presumed to have been made to Mortgagor by Lender. The Note allegedly is evidence of said debt. Lender never made such a loan to Mortgagor. The Note itself, being the obligation to pay, would have provided the cash value that funded Mortgagor. The Note itself, being the obligation to pay, would have provided the cash value that funded Lender's alleged loan check that Lender paid to on behalf of Mortgagor (*Money and Banking* by David H. Friedman, American Bankers Association, page 36).

The granting of the Note by Mortgagor to Lender is not evidence of a loan under which the Mortgage is able to take its intended effect. Lender, as a banking institution organized and functioning under jurisdiction of the United States of America, is forbidden from lending its own credit to borrowers. Banks cannot lend depositors' money to borrowers without the depositors' written authorization. In reality, banks do not lend their depositors' money (12 United States Code, Section 1828).

All public United States banking institutions such as Lender are member banks of the Federal Reserve Bank. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, "In <u>exchange</u> for the note or security, the lending or investing institution credits the <u>depositor's</u> account or gives a check that can be deposited at yet another depository institution" (*Two Faces of Debt*, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, page 19).

Title Holder has not been able to discover, despite extensive research, evidence that Lender did in fact lend Mortgagor anything from its assets. However, Title Holder has discovered through research that Lender deposits a mortgage-secured note as an asset into a checking account set up in a title holder's name, then issues a check or a wire transfer against said deposited asset to or on behalf of that title holder as a "loan" without disclosure to the title holder that, in fact, the title holder was depositing the promissory note and that Lender returned the same as a "loan" and charged the title holder, the alleged borrower, interest to boot (Money and returned by David H. Friedman, American Bankers Association, page 86). In Lender's efforts to deceive the Banking by David H. Friedman, American Bankers Association, page 86). In Lender's efforts to deceive the title holder into believing the Lender loaned money to the title holder, Lender deposited the note as "money" from which to issue a check. Lender loaned no lawful money to provide the consideration necessary to legally fulfill the contract (note) indebting the title holder. Ipso facto, without a valid note to secure, Lender cannot own a valid mortgage to create a lien on the title holder's real estate. By deceiving the title holder in this way, Lender creates a fraudulent lien on real property without risking or using one bit of its own assets.

1315048012 Page: 3 of 3

UNOFFICIAL COPY

If Lender, its successors and/or assigns alleges to hold the Note, then the value of the deposited Note is due to Mortgagor from the checking account Lender set up in Mortgagor's name, which Lender credited in order to issue the check; it is still owed to Mortgagor. Lender never loaned Mortgagor Lender's money and Lender never provided consideration under the Note, and thus the Note contract is void *ab initio*. Without loaning Mortgagor lawful money, Lender deposited Mortgagor's "money" (Note as promise to pay = value = "money"), withdrew it and claimed it was Lender's money and that Lender loaned this money to Mortgagor.

Assignee, as holder of Lender's fraudulent documents and instruments, owes Mortgagor the full amount which Lender claimed that Lender loaned Mortgagor. Assignee hitherto has failed to give or *lend* any money, credit or anything at all of value to Mortgagor. Therefore, Assignee's claims upon the Property are fraudulent and void.

The Note and the Mortgage associated with it are unenforceable as instruments of indebtedness against Mortgagor. The Subject Mortgage is not able to secure repayment of a loan which never existed. Furthermore, the fraud, deception, and failure to disclose the material facts revealing the nature of the transaction to Mortgagor vitiates any agreement or contract entered into by the two parties, ab initio.

"Any false representation of material facts made with knowledge of falsity and with intent that it shall be acted on by another in entering into contract, and which is so acted upon, constitutes 'fraud,' and entitles party deceived to avoid contract or recover damages" (Barnsdall Refining Corn. v. Birnam Wood Oil Co. 92 F 26 817).

Any and all deeds, certificates of sale, or any other transfers, assignments, liens, certificates of beneficial interest or ownership, or any other instrument(s) claiming or otherwise alleging to transfer title or color of title to Lender or Lender's successors, or ary of its agents, heirs, assignees, servicers, fiduciaries, trustees, beneficiaries, officers, holders, or other parties are incorporated herein by reference as sharing the fraudulent nature of the Note and Mortgage described above. Any interested party must construe any such instrument(s) recorded with relation to the Mortgage to be slanderous, libelous and defamatory.

Title Holder will hold any and all parties participating in preparation, circulation, recording, and otherwise handling of any current or future instruments associated with the Mortgage as liable for damages and may prosecute the same for slander of title and other claims to the fullest extent of the law.

Maurel Mastrus
Signature and/or Seal

Date