

**LAW OFFICE OF ROLLIE R. HANSON, S.C.**

6737 W. Washington Street • Suite 1420 • West Allis, WI 53214  
Telephone (414) 321-9733 • Facsimile (414) 321-9601  
www.hansonlaw.net

Rollie R. Hanson  
Attorney at Law  
[Rollie@hansonlaw.net](mailto:Rollie@hansonlaw.net)  
Jared Nusbaum, Attorney  
[Jared@hansonlaw.net](mailto:Jared@hansonlaw.net)  
Kelly Jager, Paralegal  
[Kelly@hansonlaw.net](mailto:Kelly@hansonlaw.net)  
Tim Hassell, Law Clerk  
[Tim@hansonlaw.net](mailto:Tim@hansonlaw.net)

November 11, 2010

Jennifer H. Johnson, Secretary  
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve  
System  
20th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20551

Re: Withdrawal Request for the Proposed Truth-in-Lending Mortgage Regulations  
(FRB Docket No. R-1390)

Dear Secretary Johnson:

I am writing to urge the Board to **withdraw** the proposed Truth in Lending (“TILA”) mortgage regulations in FRB Docket No. R-1390.<sup>1</sup> I am an attorney in private practice in the Milwaukee area in Wisconsin and have represented a many homeowners facing foreclosure, especially over the last 5 years. A number of these individuals have been able to rescind their mortgages due to violations of the Truth in Lending in Act. At the present time and given the record number of foreclosures, now is the time to reinforce the fundamental importance of TILA rescission. Instead, **the Board’s proposal would eviscerate the single most effective tool that homeowners have to stop foreclosures and avoid predatory loans: the extended right of rescission.** I honestly do not understand how the Board would even consider such radical change in TILA. Respectfully, it appears the rule to change the right of rescission flies in the face of the statute and case law. I question how the Board could propose this kind of change and even whether proper authority exists to make a rule that would, in effect take away the homeowner’s statutory right of rescission.

I also note that FRB Docket R-1390 contains a series of proposed changes to the TILA rules governing mortgage lending. A few of the proposed changes, including new “material disclosures” for home secured credit, would advance consumer protections. Some changes are neither particularly damaging nor particularly beneficial to consumers. Other parts of the proposal, however, would seriously undermine the reliability of TILA disclosures on home secured credit. Instead of informing consumers about the terms of their loans as Congress intended, these proposals would allow broad misstatements of loan terms through new tolerances that are without statutory authority.

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/press/bcreg/20100816e.htm>.

Jennifer H. Johnson, Secretary  
November 11, 2010  
Page 2

My greatest concern however, is the proposed decimation of TILA's right of rescission. At the depths of the worst foreclosure crisis since the Great Depression, we are surprised that the Federal Reserve Board has proposed rules that would eviscerate the primary protection homeowners currently have to escape abusive loans and avoid foreclosure: the extended right of rescission in 12 CFR § 226.15 and 226.23. **I do not understand how the Federal Reserve could in good faith even consider this idea. Please consider the rights of the homeowners in this country and not the desires of the banking industry.**

The Truth in Lending Act passed by Congress specifically provides consumers the right to unwind an illegal loan through "rescission" for up to three years after the loan was consummated. The statute – and current Board regulations – both provide that if the proper disclosures were not provided to the homeowner at the closing, the homeowner can rescind the loan by sending a notice to the creditor. The statute then requires the creditor to cancel the security interest. Only *after* the creditor has complied with its obligation to cancel the security interest, is the homeowner required to pay back the lender the amount still due on the loan. This order of obligations is the essence of the protection provided by TILA's extended right of rescission. The cancelling of the security interest means that the homeowner has a defense to a foreclosure. It also means that the homeowner has the means to obtain refinancing so as to be able to tender the amount due. The extended right of rescission does *not* mean that the homeowner does not have to repay the loan. While the amount due is reduced by the finance charges, fees and amounts the homeowner has already paid, the balance is still due the creditor.

Despite the clear order of these events set out in the Act passed by Congress, the Board's proposed regulations would make the extended right of rescission useless by requiring that the homeowner must *pay the entire amount demanded by the creditor* before the creditor is required to cancel the security interest in the home. This proposed changed order will undermine the primary purpose and power of TILA's extended right of rescission – the mandatory cancellation of the security interest by the creditor upon receipt of the homeowner's notice. It is the order of events which has meant that the extended right of rescission under TILA has been the primary home-saving legal tool against predatory loans and foreclosures for the past forty-two years. This proposal would make it completely useless to all but the wealthiest homeowners.

The extended right of rescission is a critical tool necessary to enforce the strict disclosure requirements in the Truth in Lending Act. It is far preferable to provide substantive limits to abusive products and features, but for the most part, regulation of our current mortgage market depends on disclosure of the real terms of the transaction to provide some balance between the parties to a mortgage transaction. If even these the disclosure requirements are undermined, most homeowners have no hope of navigating the mostly *caveat emptor* nature of today's mortgage market.

In the great majority of cases brought to stop a foreclosure in the majority of states, TILA rescission claims are included. Passage of the proposed rule will considerably exacerbate foreclosure statistics in this nation – harming countless homeowners, communities and the economy. I have found and used TILA rescission claims in many cases in which I have represented homeowners in foreclosure. While this is often not the only defense raised, it is one of the most effective and gives the homeowner statutory rights that Congress intended in order to carry out the purpose of TILA in

Jennifer H. Johnson, Secretary  
November 11, 2010  
Page 3

real terms for real human beings. **Once again, I am at a loss to understand how this proposal came about. Who wrote it and to what end? It absolutely will not carry out the intent of Congress in enforcing TILA and will not help homeowners at a time they need all the help they can get when facing foreclosure.**

The tolerances and changes to the material disclosures also proposed in this docket would also harm consumers.

For these reasons, I request that you withdraw the entire docket, and leave the update of TILA to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau when it takes over this area in July, 2011.

Sincerely,

*Rollie R. Hanson*  
Rollie R. Hanson, Esq.