

Collection requires the Original Note

Where the complaining party can not prove the existence of the note, then there is no note. To recover on a promissory note, the plaintiff must prove: (1) the existence of the note in question; (2) that the party sued signed the note; (3) that the plaintiff is the owner or holder of the note; and (4) that a certain balance is due and owing on the note. See in Re: SMS Financial LLC. v. Abco Homes, Inc. No. 98-50177 February 18, 1999 (167 F. 3d. 235: 5th Circuit Court of Appeals.)

Volume 29 of the New Jersey Practice Series, Chapter 10 Section 123, Page 566, emphatically states, "...: and no part payments should be made on the bond or note unless the person to whom payment is made is able to produce the bond or note unless the person to whom payment is made is able to produce the bond or note and the part payments are endorsed thereon. It would seem that the mortgagor would normally have a Common law right to demand production or surrender of the bond or note and mortgage, as the case may; be. See Restatement, Contracts S 170(3), (4) (1932); C.J.S. Mortgages S 469 in Carnegie Bank v Shalleck 256 N. J. Super 23 (App. Div 1992),606A2d389, the Appellate Division held, "When the underlying mortgage is evidenced by an instrument meeting the criteria for negotiability set forth in N.J.S. 12A:3-104, the holder of the instrument shall be afforded all the rights and protections provided a holder in due course pursuant to N.J.S. 12A:3-302" Since no one is able to produce the "instrument" there is no competent evidence before the Court that any party is the holder of the alleged note or the true holder in due course. New Jersey common law dictates that the plaintiff prove the existence of the alleged note in question, prove that the party sued signed the alleged note, prove that the plaintiff is the owner **and holder** of the alleged note, and prove that certain balance is due and owing on any alleged note. Federal Circuit Courts have ruled that the only way to prove the perfection of any security is by actual possession of the security. See Matter of Staff Mortg. & Inv. Corp., 550 F.2d 1228 (9th Cir 1977), "Under the Uniform Commercial Code, the only notice sufficient to inform all interested parties that a security interest in instruments has been perfected is actual possession by the secured party, his agent or bailee." Bankruptcy Courts have followed the Uniform Commercial Code. In Re Investors & Lenders, Ltd. 165 B.R.389 (Bkrtcy.D.N.J.1974), "Under the New Jersey Uniform Commercial Code (NJUCC), promissory note is "instrument," security interest in which must be perfected by possession..." Unequivocally the Court's rule is that in order to prove the "instrument", possession is mandatory. In addition to the note, another element of proof

is necessary - an accounting that is signed and dated by the person responsible for the account. Claim of damages, to be admissible as evidence, must incorporate records such as a general ledger and accounting of an alleged unpaid promissory note, the person responsible for preparing and maintaining the account general ledger must provide a complete accounting which must be sworn to and dated by the person who maintained the ledger. See Pacific Concrete F.C.U.v.Kauanoë, 62 Haw.334,614P.2d936 (1980), GE Capital Hawaii, Inc. v. Yonenaka 25P.3d 807,96 Hawaii32,(Hawaii App2001), Fooks v. Norwich Housing Authority 28Conn.L.Rptr.371,(Conn.Super.2000), and Town of Brookfield v. Candlewood Shores Estates, Inc. 513 A.2d 1218, 201 Conn.1(1996)