Minista Order Form (rev. 3/886)

# UNOFFICIAL GOP Y 9116596

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

Judgo or Magistrale	Suzanne B.	Conlon	Sitting SudgetM Then Assigned			
Case Number	88 C	5284	Da	ate Jur	ne 28, 1989	A Property of
Case	First Wisconsin v. Dutch Gap Properties, et al.					
Title						(a. 8)
OTION: [In the plaintiff	following box (a) in f, and (b) state brief	ndicate the party filingly the nature of the	ng the motion, e.g., motion being preser	nted]	int, 3d-party	
Defendants'	ection for Re	consideration		Bent for M	Crotting	
,	0	ny ye.		Control of	CAPARIENT	to A.
	0			JUN 21	1989	en e
·				OH HA	311 1989	restricted points
		<u>O</u> .e		76 1 15 15 1 1	i isomie il 170 nito technico esc	12 2 2
CKET ENTRY:	(The	balanc of his form	is reserved for not	ations by court st	aff.)	
				A THE STATE OF THE	And the second s	
(1) Judgme	nt is entered as follows:	0/	(2) X	(Other docket on		$0.0_{ m g}$ to $2.76_{ m c}$
, , ,		1		in a de la deservación de la deservación de la decembra de la decembra de la decembra de la decembra de la dec La decembra de la de	i igi safig kili ki Kalindag sakili	
Defendants' m	stion to alte	r or amand full	Lucke do dand	tad Pinat (	lisconsin's	motion
DOTAMORISM	SCHOM FO WHEE	T OF GREETS JOS	Metir 'ra neni	mandail and a single and		
	Kristinia (Baritina)	CANDINE F		33.33.40000	A Same	was 10
	Kristinia (Baritina)	red on Count I		(See rever	se for deca	118.)
	Kristinia (Baritina)	red on Count I	i is greated.	(See rover)	se for deca	ua 10 Usi)ar graldist
	judgment ente	red on Count I	is greated.	(See rever	se for deca	ua 10 Us.)ar grabbar gras
	judgment ente	red on Gount I	is greated.	(See rover)	se for deca	ua 10 Us.)ar grabbar gras
to amend the	judgment ente	red on Count I	is greated.	(See rover)	se for deca	ua 10 Us.)ar grabbar yurs
to amend the	judgment ente	red on Count I	is greated.	(See rover)	se for deca	ua 10 Us.)ar grabbar yurs
to amend the	judgment ente	red on Count I	is granted.	(See rever	se for deca	ua 10 Us.)ar grabbar yurs
to amend the Piled me Brief in Answer	judgment ente	red on Count I	is acoured.	(See rover)	se for deca	ua 10 Us.)ar grabbar yurs
Piled me	judgment ente	red on Count I	Reply to aust	(See rever	se for deta	ua 10 Us.)ar grabbar yurs
Filed my Brief in Answer! Status be	tion of [use listing in "M support of motion due learing heid	red on Count I	is acented.	(See rever	se for deta	0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0
Piled mo	tion of Just listing in "M support of motion dus series to motion dus sering on sering heid [	red on Count I	Reply to austract of the last for the last f	(See raver)	se for deta	0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0
Filed mend the Brief in Answer is Pretrial c	tion of [use listing in "M support of motion due learing on string beid [ set for ]	red on Count I	Reply to austract of the last for the last f	(See raver)	se for deta	0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0 (0
Filed mend the Brief in Answer!  Spanished Trial [1]	tion of Just listing in "M support of motion dus listing on string held conference hold set for such trial fur	red on Count I	Reply to austrict for set for	(See rever)  VILLAMAY  Iwer brief dus  set for  set for  fessel for	se for deta	118.)20 118.)20 27.78
Filed my Brief in Answer!    Status be   Previal c	tion of [use listing in "M support of motion due learing on string beid [ set for sect trial fur	continued to continued to continued to flearing that without with	Reply to austred and for set f	(See rever)	se for deta	118.) 20 118.) 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20
Filed mend the Brief in Answer!    Answer!   Fretrial c.   In	tion of Just listing in "M support of motion due listing on string heid conference hold set for	red on Count I	Reply to austred a rest for rest for rest for rest for rest for rest for the prejudice and without the 21 (want of prosecution)	(See rever)	se, for deta	Dursuant to
Filed mond the Brief in Answer!    Status be   Pretrial c	tion of Just listing in "M support of motion dus learing on string held conference hold set for anch trial fur the dismissed RCP 4(j) (failure to serve	continued to continued to continued to continued to fract for without General Ru conder on the reverse of	Reply to sustant for resident for resident set for reside	(See rever)  AAAAA  iwer brief dus  set for  set for  resel for  ut costs  on)  [FRC	by agreement  D'41(a)(1)  mule order form.)	Dursuant to
Filed my Brief in Spatus be Previal control of Trial This case of Trial Trial This case of Trial Trial Trial Case of Trial C	tion of Just listing in "M support of motion due learing aring heid conference hold set for each trial fur sis dismissed RCP 4(j) (failure to serve ther detail see X ired.	continued to continued to continued to continued to fract for without General Ru conder on the reverse of	Reply to sustant for resident for resident set for reside	(See rever)  AAAAA  iwer brief dus  set for  set for  resel for  ut costs  on)  [FRC	se, for deta	pursuant to
Filed mend the Brief in Answer & Fretrisi c. Trial This case Y (For furth No notices requestion Notices mailed)	tion of [use listing in "M support of motion due learing on string beid sating on set for leating on set for leating on set for leating on set for leating on leating	continued to continued to continued to continued to flearing without with General Receives of	Reply to austract of set for respective and without the prejudice and without the 21 (want of prosecution order attacts).	(See rever)  Analy  Wer brief dus  set for  set for  peacl for  ut costs  on)  process  proce	by agreement  P 41(a) (1)  nule order form.)  number of notices date	pursuant to  FRCP 41(5X2)
Filed me Brief in Answer t  Trial This case  Notices mailed Notified counse	tion of Just listing in "M support of motion due listing on sering held set for listing in "M set for listing on set for listing in "M set for listing in	continued to continued to continued to continued to fract for without General Ru conder on the reverse of	Reply to austract of set for respective and without the prejudice and without the 21 (want of prosecution order attacts).	(See rever)  AAAAA  iwer brief dus  set for  set for  resel for  ut costs  on)  [FRC	by agreement  D'41(a)(1)  mule order form.)  mule order form.)  dato docketed	pursuant to
Filed me  Filed me  Filed me  Fretrial c	tion of [use listing in "M support of motion due learing aring heid [ set for active her detail see X tred, try judge's staff, iby telephone. till notices.	continued to continued to continued to continued to flearing without with General Receives of	Reply to austract of set for respective and without the prejudice and without the 21 (want of prosecution order attacts).	(See rever)  Analy  Wer brief dus  set for  set for  peacl for  ut costs  on)  process  proce	by agreement  P 41(a) (1)  nule order form.)  number of notices date	pursuant to
Filed mend the Brief in Spiel	ition of [use listing in "M support of motion due learing on stiff to motion due learing heid set for such trial fur set dismissed RCP 4(j) (failure to serve her detail see X ired. Try judge's staff. Ity telephone. Sill notices.	continued to continued to continued to continued to flearing without with General Receives of	Reply to aussi set for res set for res set for reside and continued to the prejudice and without the 21 (want of prosecution order atta	(See revery	by agreement  D 41(a) (1)  number of notices  date dricketed dricketing dpty, initials date mid.	pursuant to
7) Filed me 4) Brief in 6 5) Answer 8 6) Pretrial c 7) Trial [ 7) This case 1) X (For further counse in the counse	tion of [use listing in "M apport of motion due learing on strict to motion due learing held sating on set for set for list dismissed RCP 4(j) (future to serve her detail see Ared, ly judge's staff, liby telephone. sell notices. sem. angistrate.	continued to continued to continued to continued to flearing without with General Receives of	Reply to austract of set for respective and without the prejudice and without the 21 (want of prosecution order attacts).	(See revery	by agreement  D 41(a) (1)  number of notices  date docketed docketing dpty, initials	pursuant to

#### WORLD UNOFFICIAL COPY

Accordingly, the defendants' motion to alter or amend judgment is denied. First Wisconsin's motion to amend the judgment entered on Count I is granted.

The defendants fail to persuade this court inst amendment is warnanched. They did not raise their allimative defences until over two months after the close of discovery and after briefing was scheduled on First Wisconsin's dispositive motion. Even assuming that the defendants are entitled to amend, they are unable to prevail. To establish waiver, they must show that First Wisconsin incentionally colp., 139 F.2d IV, 19 (7th Cir.), ceit. denied, il. U.S. 678 (1942). The facts demonstrate that First Wisconsin's failure to compute interest was the result of an unintentional mistake of fact. Memorandum opinion at 8, 11. To prevail under an estoppel theory, the defendants must show they were ignorant of their alleged obligation to pay interest. The undisputed facts show that First Wisconsin informed the defendants on several occasions prior to the sale of the indiana property, of their obligation to pay deferred interest. Memorandum opinion at 10, 11. The defendants' belated claim of ignorance in the face of this this face of the colpies of the colpies.

The defendants move for reconsideration of the judgment entered against them in Count II. They contend that First Wisconsin's claim of unjust enrichment is subject to the defenses of waiver and estoppel. The defendants failed to plead these defenses in the defenses in The defendants failed to plead these defenses in answer to the complaint. Finto Tracking Service, Inc. v. Motor Dispatch, Inc., 649 F.2d 530, 534 (7th Cir. 1911). Generally, any defense in pleaded is waived. Id. However, failing Comply with Rule 8(c) is not latel if the defense is raised in a manner that does not result in unfair surprise. Devalk Lincoln Mercury, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co., unfair surprise. Devalk Lincoln Mercury, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co.,

First Wisconsin claims this court erred by not awarding interest, attorneys' tees and costs on its claim against Dutch Gap. The judgment entered against Dutch Gap in Count I awards First Wisconsin \$105,651,98. This figure represents the total amount of deterred interest owed under the promissory note. However, the note expressly provides for attorneys' tees and expenses, as well as prejudgment interest at seven percent. Under Indiana Law, contractual pro visions authorizing attorneys' fees, under Indiana Law, contractual pro visions authorizing attorneys' fees, and interest are enforceable. Parish v. Terre Haute Savings Bank, 122 Ind. App. 636, 438 N.E.2d 1, 3 (4th Dist. 1982). Accordingly, the judgment and Court I is amended to include interest at the rate of the judgment and Court I is amended to include interest at the rate of seven percent, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

Plaintiff First Wisconsin Trust Company and defendants State and Savings Bank, Donald F. Schroud and Selim N. Mayer ("the defendants") move this court to alter or amend its judgment order of May 1, 1989. That order granted summary judgment to First Wisconsin against Dutch Gap Properties, Inc. for amounts owed under a promissory note. The order also entered judgment against the defendants on First Wisconsin's order also entered judgment against the defendants on First Wisconsin's claim for unjust enrichment.

ОВрек

AO 450 (Rev. 5/85) Judgment in a Civil Gase. @

Manage on UN 30 1389

### United States Bistrict Court

#### NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Eastern Division

Elrat Wisconsin

AMENDED

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

Dutch Cap Properties, et al.

CASE NUMBER:

88 C 5284

- ☐ Jury Verdict. This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury has rendered its verdict.
- 🛱 Decision by Court. This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment on Count I is amended to include interest at the rate of seven percent, reasonable atterneys' fees and costs. C/ort's Office

June 28, 1989

Date

Claudia M. Flagg

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1885-808-002

Property of Coot County Clert's Office

#### Minute Crear Porm

# UNOFFICIAL COPY 90116596

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

ludge or Magistrate	Suzanne B. Conlon	Sitting Judge/Meg. If Other Than Assigned Judge/Meg.		
Case Number	88 C 5284	Date	May 1, 198	39
Case Title	First Wisconsin v. Dutc	h Gap, et al.	······································	
	following box (a) indicate the party file, and (b) state briefly the nature of the	motion being presented)	•	•
Plaintiff's	Motion for Summary Judgmo	ont Sent	for Microff 1AY U.A. 1989	m Pai
Defendants'	Motion for Summary Judgme	ont /	1AY U.1.1000	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Ŷ.	Elimed	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	MAY 4 5 1989
	Ox			
OCKET ENTRY:	(The balance of this form	n is reserved for notations by c	ourt staff.)	MA - TT
// <b>K</b> (**)	A la cabaca de actualment	(A) [1]	nekal enimil	
(1) Judgmen	A la entered an follows:	(2) L (Other d	ockel entry!]	
First Wisconsi	n's motion for summary jud	igment on Counts I an	d II ie gran	tud,
Dofondants mot.	ion for summary judgment i	a dontad. Judgmont	is entered f	or First
	Company and against Dutc			
	Count I. Judgment is ent ite and Savings Bank, Don			
in the amount of	16 \$105,709.46. ENTER MEM	ORANDUM OPINION AND	15 16 15 19 15	
			Hegenosi	B. Conton
			4	
			1 0	
(3) Piled mot	on of Juse tlating in "MOTION" twa above).		9, _	
january .	on of [use listing in "MOTION" box shove].  pport of motion dus		0,0	
(4) Brief in su (5) Answer in	pport of motion due	Reply to answer trief due .	<u>0,0</u>	Carriery with a second of
(4) Brief in su (5) Answer br	pport of motion due			
(4) Brief in su (5) Answer br (6) Ru	pport of motion due	Reply to answer belef due .		
(4) Brief in su (5) Answer br (6) Status beau	pport of motion due  of to motion due  aring  ing  held  continued to	Reply to answer brief due .		
(4) Brief in su (5) Answer br (6) Ru (7) Status hear (8) Yetrial core	pport of motion due  If to motion due  Arion  Iling On  Ing Continued to	Reply to answer belef due		al
(4) Brief in eu (5) Answer in (6) Ite (7) Status hea (8) Trial	pport of motion due  If to motion due  Ariog  Iling  Theid  Continued to  Literance  Baki  Continued to  Teset for  Teset for	Reply to answer belef due		al annual property of the second
(4) Brief in eu (5) Answer br (6) Ru (7) Status bear (8) Pretrial cor (9) Trial	pport of motion due  of to motion due  of to motion due  of tog  ing  on  fing  held  continued to  firence  beki  continued to  set for  reset for  set friel  fury trial  lifearing	Reply to answer brief due		al
(4) Brief in eu (5) Answer br (6) Ite (7) Status bear (8) Trial (9) Trial (1) His case (1)	pport of motion due  aring ling on  tierence beld continued to  set for reset for  set first Jury trial lifearing  a dismissed without with	Reply to answer belef due	N	al
(4) Brief in eu (5) Answer br (6) Status bear (8) Status bear (9) Frial (0) Dec (1) This case i	pport of motion due  ariog ling on  tierence bald continued to  set for reset for  ach trial Jury bial lifearing  a diamissed without with	Reply to answer brief due	by agreement  17RCP 41(a) (1)	pursuant to  FRCP 41(6X2)
(4) Brief in eu (5) Answer br (6) Status bear (7) Status bear (8) Frial Cor (9) Frial Cor (10) Dec (11) This case i	pport of motion due  ariog ling on  tierence bald continued to  set for reset for  ach trial Jury bial lifearing  a diamissed without with	Reply to answer brief due	by agreement  17RCP 41(a) (1)  ginal minute order form	pursuant to  FRCP 41(6X2)
(4) Brief in au (3) Answer br (6) Status bear (8) Status bear (9) Frial (10) Der (11) This case if (17) FRI (18) No notices require	ppoet of motion due  ariog ling on  tierence beki continued to  set for reset for  set for reset for  set field without with  CP 4(j) (faiture to serve) Clerenti Re  or detail see order on the reverse of	Reply to answer brief due.    set for	by agreement  17RCP 41(a) (1)	al
(4) Brief in eu (5) Answer hr (6) Ite (7) Status hear (8) I'retrial cor (9) Trial (1) This case it (1) I'retrial (2) X (I'or further (No notices mailed by	ppoet of motion due  ariog ling on  tierence beki continued to  set for reset for  set for reset for  set field without with  CP 4(j) (faiture to serve) Clerenti Re  or detail see order on the reverse of	Reply to answer brief due.    set for	by agreement    17KCP 41(a) (1)   ginal minute order form   number   of notices   data	pursuant to  FRCP 41(6X2)
(4) Brief in eu (5) Answer br (6) Pie (7) Status hea (8) Pretrial con (9) Trial (10) Des (11) This case if (10) PR  No notices require Notices mailed by Notified countel to	ppoet of motion due  ariog ling on  tierence beki continued to  set for reset for  set for reset for  set field without with  CP 4(j) (faiture to serve) Clerenti Re  or detail see order on the reverse of	Reply to answer brief due.    set for	by agreement  17(CP 41(a) (1)  ginal minute order form  number of notices date docketed	al
(4) Brief in eu (3) Answer br (6) Ru (7) Status bear (8) Prist Cor (9) Frist De (10) De (11) This case if PR (10) No notices require Notices mailed by Notified counsel it Docketing to mail	pport of motion due  aring ling on  tierence beld continued to  set for reset for  set first lury trial lifearing  a dismissed without with  the continued of the continued to  set first or reset for  set first lury trial continued to  and trial see order on the reverse of  the continued of the continued to  set first lury trial continued to  set for reset for  set first lury trial continued to  set for order on the reverse of  the continued to  set for reset for  set for continued to  set for continue	Reply to answer brief due	by agreement  17(CP 41(a) (1)  ginal minute order form  number of notices date docketed docketing	pursuant to  FRCP 41(6)(2)  Document #
(4) Brief in eu (3) Answer hr (6) Ite (6) Ru (7) Status heat (8) Ivetrial cor (9) Trial (10) De (11) This case it (10) PRO (11) No notices require (11) Notices mailed by (12) Notified counsel it (13) Docketing to mail (14) Mail AO 450 form	pport of motion due  ariog ling on  ring held continued to  set for reset for  set first hury trial lieute  a diamissed without with  or detail see order on the reverse of  pudge's staff.  by telephone.  notices.	Reply to answer brief due.  aut for	by agreement  17RCP 41(a) (1)  ginal minute order form  number of notices date docketed docketing dpty, initials	pursuant to  FRCP 41(6)(2)  Document #
(4) Brief in eu (5) Answer br (6) Ru (7) Status bear (8) Prist Cor (9) Trial (10) Der (11) This case I (12) X (Por furth) No notices require Notices mailed by Notifled counsel to Docketing to mail	propert of motion due  ariog ling on  ting held continued to  sterence beld continued to  set for reset for  set for reset for  set field without with  CP 4(1) (faiture to serve) Cleraral Re or detail see order on the reverso of  set.  Pudge's staff.  sy talephone.  notices.  a.  gistrate.	Reply to answer brief due.    set for	by agreement  17RCP 41(a) (1)  ginal minute order form  number of notices date docketed docketing dpty, initials	pursuant to PRCP 41(6)(2)  Document //

The contract country contract of the contract

Hasterly

MAY (14 1989)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

FIRST WISCONSIN TRUST COMPANY, as Trustee under Indenture of Mortgage and Deed of Trust dated October 10, 1967

Plaintiff,

٧.

DUTCH GAP PROPERTIES, INC., STATE AND SAVINGS BANK as Trustee under Trust Agreement dated August 15, 1986 and known as Trust No 199, DONALD F. SCHROUD and SELIM N. MAYER,

Defendants.

No. 88 C 5284

Judge Suzanne B. Conlon

#### MEMORANDUM COMMION AND ORDER

Plaintiff First Wisconsin Trust Company ("First Wisconsin") commenced this action against defendants Dutch Gap Properties, Inc. ("Dutch Gap"), State and Sayings Bank, Donald F. Schroud ("Schroud") and Selim N. Mayer ("Mayer") to recover deferred interest allegedly due on a promissory note. Diversity jurisdiction is based on 28 U.S.C. § 1332. All parties move for summary judgment under Fed.R.Civ.P. 56.

#### FACTS

The roots of this action extend back to 1964 when Dutch Gap borrowed \$1,191,000 from Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America ("Teachers"). Complaint § 10. Dutch Gap

46

医克特氏 医阿特特特 有一点的人的 AL DESTRUCTIONS OF THE

Coot County Clart's Office

No. 88 C 5284

-2-

property located in White County, Indiana ("the property"). Id.

First Wisconsin purchased the loan from Teachers and became the truster after Dutch Gap exchanged the original note for a series A note and simultaneously executed an indenture of mortgage and deed of trust ("the mortgage"). First Wisconsin Facts § 7. The note and the mortgage are secured by the property. Id.

The moregage and note expressly state that in addition to current interest, the note shall bear additional or deferred interest payable at maturity. First Wisconsin Facts ¶¶ 8, 9. Schroud and Mayer were advised of the financial structure of the note when they purchased the property on May 19, 1986. Id. at ¶ 12. The purchase agreement expressly stated that Schroud and Mayer were informed that, as of February 20, 1986, the unpaid principal on the note was \$289,418.42 and the accrued deferred interest payable at maturity was \$95,021.00. Id

When Schroud and Mayer purchased the property, they became the sole shareholders of Dutch Gap. Id. at ¶ 10. In addition, they simultaneously conveyed the property to a trust maintained in Indiana by State and Savings Bank ("the trust").

Id. at ¶ 10. They also contacted First Wisconsin and requsted an accounting of their liability on the note. Id. at ¶ 19. By letter dated September 2, 1986, First Wisconsin informed Schroud and Mayer that the outstanding principal on the note was

Los Cottons Clert's Office

No. 88 C 5284

-3-

\$254,094.11 and that the deferred interest was \$95,021.50. <u>Id</u>.

However, First Wisconsin also informed them that the deferred interest would increase to \$96,519.68 by October 15, 1986, pursuant to the note's amortization schedule. <u>Id</u>. at ¶¶ 19, 21.

Schroud and Mayer owned the property until 1988, when they instructed the trust to execute a sales contract. Id. at \$\frac{1}{2}\$. Before proceeding with negotiations, Schroud and Mayer again requested First Wisconsin to prepare an accounting of their liability on the note. Id. at \$\frac{1}{2}\$. But this time they requested a payoff letter indicating the total debt due if the note were paid off on April 15, 1988. Li. First Wisconsin responded to this request by preparing a payoff letter based on information contained in its computer system. Id. at \$\frac{1}{2}\$. At \$\frac{1}{2}\$ 31. First Wisconsin's computer system did not show that deferred interest was owed on the note. Id. Accordingly, when a First Wisconsin employee calculated the note's principal and interest based on the figures generated by the bank's computer system, the final payoff amount omitted the deferred interest component. Id. at \$\frac{1}{2}\$.

The payoff figures submitted to Schroud and Mayer included \$142,283.00 in principal and \$1,911.93 in interest.

Id. at ¶ 34. Schroud and Mayer relied on these figures when they negotiated the sale of the property. Defendants Facts ¶ 5. However, they did not verify the accuracy of the payoff amount, or whether First Wisconsin mistakenly omitted the deferred interest component. First Wisconsin Facts ¶ 37.

Proberty of Coot County Clerk's Office

No. 88 C 5284

-4-

On April 6, 1988, Schroud and Mayer sold the property for \$1,189,716.51. Id. at ¶ 39. The closing occurred in Indiana. Id. at ¶ 38. Shortly afterwards, First Wisconsin discovered that it neglected to include the amount of deferred interest in its payoff letter. Id. at ¶ 42. On April 14, 1988, First Wisconsin sont a revised payoff letter to the attorneys for Schroud and Mayer informing them that the note's deferred interest component was \$105,709.96. Id. at ¶ 43. However, on April 15, 1988, Schroud and Mayer instructed their Indiana escrow agent to pay off the note in accerdance with First Wisconsin's original payoff letter. Id. at ¶ 45. First Wisconsin subsequently informed Dutch Gap, Schroud and Mayer that they were in default on their obligations under the note. Id. at ¶ 48.

#### DISCUSSION

A motion for summary judgment under Fed.R.Civ.P. 56 should be granted only if there are no material facts in dispute and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247 (1955);

Silverman v. Ballantine, 694 F.2d 1091, 1093 (7th Cir. 1962). A party responding to a motion for summary judgment must set forth specific facts supporting the existence of a genuine issue for trial. Powers v. Dole, 782 F.2d 689, 694 (7th Cir. 1986); Posey v. Skyline Corp., 702 F.2d 102, 105 (7th Cir. 1983). All reasonable factual inferences must be viewed in favor of the non-movant.

204 COUNTY CLOPATS OFFICE

No. 88 C 5284

-5-

Hermes v. Hein, 742 F.2d 350, 353 (7th Cir. 1984); Korf v. Ball State Univ., 726 F.2d 1222, 1226 (7th Cir. 1984).

#### A. Choice of Law

A federal court sitting in diversity applies the choice of law rules of the forum state. Klaxon v. Stentor Electric Mfq. Co., 313 U.S. 487, 496-97 (1941); American Home Assurance Co. v. Dykema, Gosset, Spencer, Goodnow & Triqq. 811 F.2d 1077, 1087 (7th Cir. 1967). In Illinois, choice of law provisions in contracts are recognized as valid and enforceable. Hofeld v. Nationwide Life Ins. Co., 59 Ill.2d 511, 322 N.E.2d 454, 458 (1975). The mortgage expressly provides that Indiana law governs the application and construction of the note. Complaint Ex. A ¶ 11.11. Applying Illinois' choice of law rules, this court shall honor the parties' contractual choice of law and apply Indiana law to the breach of contract claim in Count I. Hofeld, 59 Ill.2d 511, 322 N.E.2d at 458.

Count II asserts a claim of unjust enrichment. Unjust enrichment is based on the equitable theory of restitution.

Borowski v. DePuy, Inc., 850 F.2d 297, 301 (7th Cir. 1988);

First Nat'l Bank of Waukesha v. Warren, 796 F.2d 999, 1000

(7th Cir. 1986); Overseas Development Disc Corp. v. Sangamo

Construction Co., Inc., 686 F.2d 498, 510-11 (7th Cir. 1982).

Under Illinois' choice of law rules, this court shall apply the most significant relationship test, set forth in Section 221 of

County Clark's Office

90116596

No. 88 C 5284

-6-

applicable to Count II. Overseas Development Disc Corp.,

686 F.2d at 510-11. This section requires examination of five
factors: (1) the place where the relationship between the parties
was centered; (2) the place where the benefit or enrichment was
received; (3) the place where the act conferring the benefit or
enrichment occurred; (4) the domicile, residence, nationality,
place of incorporation or place of business of the parties; and

(5) the place where property substantially related to the enrichment was situated at the time of the enrichment. Restatement
(Second) of Restitution § 221, Overseas Development Disc Corp.,

686 F.2d at 510-11.

The focal point of the parries' relationship was a parcel of Indiana property pledged as security for the mortgage and note. Without the Indiana property, First Wisconsin would not have agreed to act as trustee.

The place where the enrichment was received is more problematic. Technically, Schroud and Mayer retained the benefits of the sale, including the funds allegedly owed to First Wisconsin, in their Chicago bank account. However, when the sale closed, Schroud and Mayer's Indiana escrow agent retained the sale proceeds at an Indiana bank. On April 15, Schroud and Mayer contacted the escrow agent and requested that the agent pay First Wisconsin the amounts due on the note. Because the escrow

Popolity of County Clark's Office

No. 88 C 5284

-7-

agent failed to pay the deferred interest, arguably Schroud and Mayer were enriched in Indiana.

The remaining contacts also point to Indiana. Although First Wisconsin computed the incorrect payoff figures at its officer in Wisconsin, the Indiana escrow agent retained the amount of deferred interest allegedly owed. Under these circumstances, the act conferring the enirchment also occurred in Indiana. Only one of the three defendants named in Count II (State and Savings Bank) resides in Indiana; Schroud and Mayer reside in Illinois. However, the parcel of land that is substantially related to the enrichment is located in Indiana. This final factor tips the balance of contacts to Indiana. Accordingly, this court shall apply Indiana law to Count II.

#### B. Motion for Summary Judgment on Count I

Count I alleges that Dutch Gap defaulted on the note by not paying the deferred interest component. Butch Gap claims that First Wisconsin is precluded from recovering this amount because its failure to request deferred interest in the original payoff letter was a mistake of law. First Wisconsin claims that the omission of the deferred interest figure was only a mistake of fact.

In Indiana, payment of less than the total amount due under an agreement does not release the debtor from liability for the balance of the debt. Markel's Administrator v.

Coot County Clert's Office

No. 88 C 5284

-8-

Spitler's Administrator, 28 Ind. 488, 491 (1867); Gearhart v.

Barker, 71 Ind. Dec. 247, 393 N.E.2d 258, 260-61 (3d Dist. 1979).

Where the creditor mistakenly advises a debtor that a lesser sum is due, the debtor is liable for the difference if the creditor made a mistake of fact. Id.; Monroe Financial Corp. v.

Disilvestre, Ind. App. , 529 N.E.2d 379, 383 (1st Dist. 1988). However, if the creditor computed the amount due based on an erroneous interpretation of contract terms, the error is a mistake of law for which no relief can be granted. P.S. & E.

West, Inc. v. Essex Group, Inc., No. 85 C 4710 slip op. at 13

(N.D. Ill. July 20, 1987); Becker v. MacDonald, Ind. App. , 488 N.E.2d 729, 731 (4th Dist. 1966).

The undisputed facts in this case establish that a First Wisconsin employee obtained payoff figures for principal and interest due on the note by using First Wisconsin's computer system. First Wisconsin Facts ¶ 31. First Wisconsin employees preparing the payoff letter based their calculations of principal and interest on the computer-generated figures. Id. at ¶¶ 32-35. They did not rely on the note itself or the mortgage to actimine whether deferred interest was owed. These facts lead inescapably to the conclusion that First Wisconsin's error was a mistake of fact and not a mistake of law. Markel's Administrator, 28 Ind. at 491; Monroe Financial Corp., 529 N.E.2d at 383; Gearhart, 393 N.E.2d at 260-61.

H County Clarks Office

90116596

No. 88 C 5284

-9-

Dutch Gap argues that the payoff letter was issued with full knowledge of the deferred interest component. Dutch Gap asks this court to conclude that First Wisconsin erroneously interpreted the terms of the note and made a mistake of law. This argument is without merit. No facts are alleged to show that First Wisconsin employees knew about the note's deferred interest provision. Indeed, deposition testimony of First Wisconsin employees catablishes just the opposite. First Wisconsin Facts 4 35, Sira Dep.; First Wisconsin Supplemental Facts 4 58, Mayer Dep.

Dutch Gap also argues that payment of the note on April 14, 1988, was an accord and satisfaction that effectively liquidated the debt. The record does not support this argument. An accord and satisfaction arises when the parties dispute the amount owed and the creditor agrees to accept a modified amount in full settlement of the dispute. Gearhart, 393 N.E.2d at 261. Here, the parties did not dispute the note's deferred interest provision prior to April 15, 1988. Before issuing the payoff letter, First Wisconsin informed Schroud and Mayer on several occasions that the note required payment of deferred interest at maturity. First Wisconsin Facts ¶ 19. Schroud and Mayer also received an amortization schedule relating to deferred interest on the note when they purchased the property in 1986. Id. at ¶ 21. Schroud and Mayer never disputed Dutch Gap's obligation to pay deferred interest.

Y OF COUNTY CLOTH'S OFFICE

## UNOFFICJĄL COPY,

No. 88 C 5284

-10-

Since it is undisputed that Dutch Gap was obligated to pay deferred interest and that deferred interest was inadvertently omitted from the payoff letter because of a computer error, First Wisconsin is entitled to judgment on its claim in Count I as a matter of law. Markel's Administrator, 28 Ind. at 491; Monroe Financial Corp., 529 N.E.2d at 383; Gearhart, 393 N.E.2d at 260-61.

#### C. Motion for Summary Judgment on Count II

Count II seaks judgment against Schroud, Mayer and :
State and Savings Bank in the amount of \$105,709.46, and a declaration that each of these defendants held this sum as constructive trustees for First Wisconsin's benefit.

First Wisconsin seeks judgment based on a theory of unjust enrichment. To recover, First Wisconsin must show the existence of an implied agreement, that it expected to receive deferred interest upon maturity of the note and that equity and good conscience demand restitution for overdue interest to prevent unjust enrichment. Stafford v. Barnard Lumber Co., Inc.

Ind. \_\_\_, 531 N.E.2d 202, 204 (1988); Indianapolis Raceway
Park v. Curtiss, 179 Ind. App. 557, 386 N.E.2d 724, 726 (1st Dist. 1979); Glick v. Seufert Construction & Supply Co., Inc., 168 Ind. App. 354, 342 N.E.2d 874, 877 (1st Dist. 1976).

Schroud and Mayer knew they were obligated to pay deferred intrest. They received a copy of the deferred interest

Poperty of County Clark's Office

No. 88 C 5284

-11-

amortization schedule when they purchased the property. On two occasions, Schroud and Mayer specifically requested that first Wisconsin provide them with a deferred interest accounting. also received the benefit of the deferred interest payments during the term of the note. These circumstances create an implied agreement between First Wisconsin and Schroud and Mayer that the deferred interest would be paid at maturity. Because First Wisconsin's failure to request payment of deferred interest in the payoff letter was a mistake of fact, equity and good conscience compel Schroud and Mayer and State and Savings Bank to make restitution to Firs: Wisconsin in the amount of \$105,709.46. However, First Wisconsin is not entitled to an award of interest or attorneys' fees. Stanley Gudyka Sales v. Lacy Forest Products Co., 686 F. Supp. 1301, 1307 (N.D. Ill. 1988); Lesher v. Baltimore Football Club, Ill. App. 496 N.E.2d 785, 792 (4th Dist. 1986); Erie-Haven v. Tippmann Refrigeration Construction, \_\_\_ Ind. App. \_\_\_, 486 N.E.2d 646, 651 (3d Dist. 1985).

Schroud and Mayer and State and Savings Bank are not constructive trustees of the funds at issue. Indiana courts permit the imposition of a constructive trust only under circumstances of fraud and undue influence. Accordingly, a constructive trust is not appropriate.

ge116596

The state of the s

No. 88 C 5284

-1.2-

#### CONCLUSIONS

First Wisconsin's motion for summary judgment on Counts I and II is granted. The court declines to impose a constructive trust on the funds at issue in Count II. Defendants' motion for summary judgment is denied.

Judgment is entered for First Wisconsin Trust

Company and Against Dutch Gap Properties, Inc. in the amount of
\$105,651.98 on Count I. Judgment is entered for First Wisconsin

Trust Company and against State and Savings Bank, Donald F.

Schroud and Selim N. Mayer on Count II in the amount of
\$105,709.46.

EliTIR:

Sugarra B Conton

United States District Judge

May 1, 1989 -

90116596

Dr. Cook Colling Clark's Office

MAY 114 1989

AQ 450 (Rev. 5/85) Judgment In a Civil Case 也

### United States Bistrict Court

#### NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS Eastern Division

First Wisconsin Trust Co.

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

V.

Dutch Gap & Otate and Savinga Bank, et al.

CASE NUMBER:

88 C 5284

☐ Jury Verdict. This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury has rendered its verdict.

ID Decision by Court. This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

TISORDERED AND ADJUDGED that surmary judgment is entered in favor of plaintiff, FIRST WISCONSIN TRUST CO., and against derandant, DUTCH GAP PROPERTIES, in the amount of \$105,651.98 on Count I. Judgment is entered in favor of plaintiff, FIRST WISCONSIN TRUST CO., and against defendants, STATE AND SAVINGS BANK, DONALD F. SCHROUD AND SELIM N. MAYER in the amount of \$105,709.46 on Counc II.

May 2, 1989

Date

H. STUART CUNNINGHAM

(By) Deputy Clerk

Claudia M. Flagg

HE CONTRIBUTION SERVICES CALLS CAN AND

90116596

To Or Cook County Clerk's Office

# UNOFFICIAL, COPY 5 9 6

Lot 1 BIK4 Shroudes Resub of Lot 112 of CE Brain Lake OA-35-404-1119 Glenview Road Glenview AL. 60025 Grove add the evonston SE 1/4 of Sec. 35-42-13

Pino 07-35-404-009

Property of Coot County Clerk's Office



