

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

January 15, 2004 LB 155

been taken place. And so technically, it did fit all of the previous statute, as it was acknowledged properly and it was actually recorded. The problem with that was, is that it was recorded after the foreclosure had already taken place, after the property, the title, had already passed to the purchaser at the trustee sale. And so there was no notice of that, but it did satisfy the statute. Does that sort of answer your question?

SENATOR BOURNE: It does. But again, I'm trying to...I'm looking for kind of a real-live example to bring this into perspective. I mean, to me, this is one of the most complicated areas of law that I'm aware of, is mortgages and leases and things of that nature. And so I'm trying...I guess what I'm saying is, subsection (2) of the bill seems to go further than what you're contemplating. And it looks like any lease that's not recorded would be secondary to a subsequent purchaser in good faith. And, I mean, is that the current status of the law?

SENATOR QUANDAHL: No. No, I wouldn't say that that is the current status of the law.

SENATOR BOURNE: So I guess what I'm suggesting is that the language as written--and correct me if I'm wrong--seems to go further than the wrong that you're trying to resolve with the bill. Is that possible? I guess I'm looking towards unintended consequences. Can you envision something along those lines?

SENATOR QUANDAHL: Well, as...you know, I'm not omnipotent, and so I can't somehow see into the future as to every single consequence that would be as a result of this. But I can tell you that LB 155 was introduced with an eye towards the Dodge County situation,...

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay.

SENATOR QUANDAHL: ...where there would be related parties, a secret lease that would...may very well have been executed before some sort of a foreclosure or subsequent transfer taking place but then being recorded after the fact.