

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

STATE OF OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES
DIVISION OF FINANCIAL REGULATION

In the Matter of:

Case No. M-24-0048

CARRIE CONVENTIONAL SERVICES
LLC; and CARRIE A. WOOD,

Respondents.

FINAL ORDERS TO CEASE AND
DESIST AND ASSESSING CIVIL
PENALTIES, ENTERED BY DEFAULT

The Division of Financial Regulation (“DFR”), acting on behalf of the Director of the Department of Consumer and Business Services for the State of Oregon (the “Director”), conducted an investigation of Carrie Conventional Services LLC (“CCS”) and Carrie A. Wood (“Wood”) (collectively, “Respondents”), and determined that they violated certain provisions of Oregon Revised Statutes (“ORS”) chapter 86A.300 to 86A.339 (the “Oregon Mortgage Loan Servicers Law”) and the Oregon Administrative Rules (“OAR”) promulgated under those laws.

On September 24, 2024, the Director issued and served on Respondents an Order to Cease and Desist, Proposed Order Assessing Civil Penalties, and Notice of Right to an Administrative Hearing (the “Notice Order”). The Notice Order offered Respondents an opportunity for a hearing if requested within 20 days of service of the Notice Order. The Notice Order further informed Respondents that if a hearing was not conducted because they did not timely request a hearing or otherwise defaulted, then the designated portion of the Division’s file and all materials submitted by Respondents in the case would automatically become part of the contested case record for the purpose of proving a prima facie case.

Division of Financial Regulation
Labor and Industries Building
350 Winter Street NE, Suite 410
Salem, OR 97301-3881
Telephone: (503) 378-4387



1 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

2 The Director FINDS that:

3 1. CCS is an entity based in the State of Pennsylvania, but is not registered with
4 the secretary of state’s office in Pennsylvania or Oregon. CCS has never applied for or held
5 a mortgage servicing license in Oregon.

6 2. On information and belief, Wood was, at the times relevant to this order, a
7 resident of the State of Pennsylvania and resides at 275 Park St., Honey Brook, PA (the
8 “Honey Brook Address”). Wood has never applied for or held a mortgage servicing license
9 in Oregon.

10 3. On information and belief, CCS is not a legitimate business, and is merely a
11 fictitious alter ego of Wood.

12 4. On August 26, 2022, the Oregon Housing Community Services agency
13 (“OHCS”) submitted a complaint to DFR related to an application that it had received for
14 benefits from the Homeowners Assistance Fund (“HAF”), which was submitted to OHCS
15 on behalf of an Oregon homeowner who owns real property in Central Point, Oregon (the
16 “Central Point Property”). The homeowner will hereafter be referred to as “DM,” and the
17 application submitted on his behalf will hereafter be referred to as the “DM Application.”
18 On the DM Application, CCS held itself out as DM’s servicer for a first position mortgage.

19 5. The DM Application included a forged mortgage statement that showed an
20 outstanding principal of \$95,000, of which it claimed that \$30,000 was immediately due.
21 The mortgage statement contained obvious alterations that included different fonts, text
22 sizing, and line breaks that did not match up. Though the mortgage statement did not refer
23 to CCS (except in a passing reference, again obviously altered, to a “Carrie Conventional
24 Customer”), Carrie A. Wood and the Honey Brook Address are prominently displayed.

25 6. The DM Application also included an unrecorded warranty deed executed
26 October 10, 2019, purporting to grant certain real property from “Carrie A Wood, as

Division of Financial Regulation
Labor and Industries Building
350 Winter Street NE, Suite 410
Salem, OR 97301-3881
Telephone: (503) 378-4387





1 Trustee of the Carrie Conventional LLC Trust,” to DM for a purchase price of \$10,000.
2 The deed contains no legal description except for reference to a prior recorded document
3 that is obviously incorrect, along with an unsigned notary block stamped by someone
4 named Victoria Bradshaw. DFR reached out to the Office of the Oregon Secretary of State,
5 which confirmed that it had no records of any licensed notary named Victoria Bradshaw,
6 and also pointed out that it only grants notary commissions for five years, even though the
7 notary commission used on the warranty deed supposedly expired in ten years.

8 7. The DM Application also included an unrecorded trust deed naming DM as the
9 “Borrower” and CCS as the “Lender,” dated October 1, 2019 (nine days before the date of
10 the warranty deed, which means that DM could not have owned the real property, even if
11 the warranty deed were real). The trust deed made no mention of any beneficiary or grantor,
12 but did name Carrie A Wood as the “Trustee” of the a trust that used DM’s last name. The
13 trust deed also included a “legal description” that would be legally insufficient to describe
14 real property, but instead appeared to be a description that would typically be used to
15 describe a home for sale be a real estate agent. Like the forged warranty deed, the trust
16 deed was also supposedly notarized by the fictitious Victoria Bradshaw.

17 8. OHCS performed a lien search on the Central Point Property and could not
18 locate any mortgage liens. DFR conducted its own search, and found no recorded trust deed
19 or other mortgage lien, and no recently recorded transfer deeds.

20 9. When contacted by DFR and questioned about various discrepancies in the DM
21 Application, along with her lack of a mortgage servicer license, Wood submitted a
22 document to DFR that purported to be a mortgage servicer license issued to her by the
23 Pennsylvania Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs (“BPOA”). DFR reached
24 out to the BPOA, which confirmed that: 1) mortgage servicers are licensed in Pennsylvania
25 under the Department of Banking and Securities, not BPOA, 2) no one by the name of
26 Carrie Wood nor CCS existed in BPOA’s licensing database, 3) the license number listed



1 on the supposed license was wrong altogether and contained a prefix reserved for out-of-
2 state real estate education providers, and 4) the license expiration date should have been
3 October 31 of each year for this specific license type, rather than the January 31 expiration
4 date used on the supposed license.

5 10. OHCS did not distribute any HAF funds related to the DM Application, due to
6 the fact that it contained so many obvious forgeries.

7 11. On June 8, 2023, OHCS submitted a new complaint to DFR related to two
8 additional application that it had received for HAF benefits, which Respondents had
9 submitted to OHCS on behalf of two other Oregon homeowners, who will hereafter be
10 referred to as “KB” and “AT.”

11 12. KB owns real property in Beaverton, Oregon (the “Beaverton Property”). The
12 application that Respondents submitted on her behalf will hereafter be referred to as the
13 “KB Application.” On the KB Application, CCS held itself out as KB’s servicer for a first
14 position mortgage.

15 13. The KB Application included a forged mortgage statement that showed an
16 outstanding principal of \$67,500, of which it claimed that \$35,255 was immediately due.
17 The mortgage statement contained obvious alterations that included different fonts, text
18 sizing, and line breaks that did not match up. The mortgage statement was dated May 25,
19 2023, which was also the supposed date that payments were due, even though the
20 transaction activity listed on the statement was from January 15 to February 15, 2022. The
21 mortgage statement claimed to be from CCS, and used the Honey Brook Address.

22 14. The KB Application also included a Verizon wireless bill that was obviously
23 forged, as it also included different fonts, text sizing, and line breaks that did not match up,
24 along with at least one blatant typo that referred to a “ccount #.”

25 15. The KB Application also included an unrecorded trust deed naming KB as the
26 “Borrower” and CCS as the “Lender,” dated September 4, 2021. The trust deed did not



1 include a legal description that would be legally sufficient to describe real property. The
2 trust deed was not notarized, which is required for recording.

3 16. AT owns real property in Mount Angel, Oregon (the “Mount Angel Property”).
4 The application that Respondents submitted on her behalf will hereafter be referred to as
5 the “AT Application.” On the AT Application, CCS held itself out as AT’s servicer for a
6 first position mortgage.

7 17. The AT Application included a forged mortgage statement that showed an
8 outstanding principal of \$92,255, of which it claimed that \$43,830 was immediately due.
9 The mortgage statement contained obvious alterations that included different fonts, text
10 sizing, and line breaks that did not match up. The mortgage statement was dated April 10,
11 2023, which was also the supposed date that payments were due, even though the
12 transaction activity listed on the statement was from June 15 to July 15, 2021 and charges
13 dated July 16 and 17, 2021 The mortgage statement claimed to be from CCS, and used the
14 Honey Brook Address.

15 18. The AT Application also included a billing statement from the Oregon Trail
16 Electric Cooperative that was obviously forged, as it contained numbers transposed and
17 had a service address of “Main St Bak 1234.” It also included a payment credit dated
18 “09/27/21” even though the statement itself was dated 05/10/23.

19 19. The AT Application also included an unrecorded trust deed naming AT as the
20 “Borrower” and CCS as the “Lender,” dated February 10, 2021. The trust deed did not
21 include a legal description that would be legally sufficient to describe real property. The
22 trust deed was not notarized, which is required for recording.

23 20. OHCS did not distribute any HAF funds related to either the KB Application or
24 the AT Application, due to the fact that both contained so many obvious forgeries.

25 ///

26 ///

1 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

2 The Director CONCLUDES that:

3 21. Pursuant to ORS 86A.306(1), a person may not directly or indirectly service a
4 residential mortgage loan in this state unless the person obtains or renews a license under
5 ORS 86A.309 by applying for and obtaining approval for such a license from the Director.

6 22. Respondents violated ORS 86A.306(1) on at least three occasions by acting as
7 a mortgage servicer without obtaining a mortgage servicer license in order to fraudulently
8 obtain monetary assistance from the HAF program.

9 23. Pursuant to ORS 86A.324(2), “[a] person that services a residential mortgage
10 loan may not, directly or indirectly: (a) [e]mploy any device, scheme or artifice to defraud
11 another person; [or] (b) [k]nowingly make an untrue statement of a material fact or omit a
12 material fact that is necessary to make the person’s statement true in light of the
13 circumstances in which the person makes the statement.”

14 24. By submitting the DM Application, the KB Application, and the AT
15 Application, Respondents held CCS out as a mortgage servicer, thus subjecting themselves
16 to the prohibitions of ORS 86A.324(2).

17 25. Additionally, each one of the DM Application, the KB Application, and the AT
18 Application was a device, scheme or artifice that Respondents attempted to use to defraud
19 OHCS and the U.S. Department of the Treasury, which operates the HAF. Thus, by
20 submitting the fraudulent applications, Respondents committed three separate violations of
21 ORS 86A.324(2)(a).

22 26. Respondents also violated ORS 86A.324(2)(b) by knowingly making untrue
23 statements of material fact in nine separate instances when they created the three fake
24 mortgage statements, which falsely claimed that CCS was the loan servicer for first
25 position mortgages that did not exist, three unrecorded trust deeds, which falsely claimed
26 that CCS was the lender on loans that did not exist, one warranty deed, which falsely

Division of Financial Regulation
Labor and Industries Building
350 Winter Street NE, Suite 410
Salem, OR 97301-3881
Telephone: (503) 378-4387





1 claimed that CCS had transferred real property to DM, a fake Verizon bill, which falsely
2 claimed that KB owed money to Verizon Wireless, and a fake utility bill, which falsely
3 claimed that AT owed money to the Oregon Trail Electric Cooperative.

4 27. Respondents also violated OAR 86A.324(2)(a)(c)(d) by filing a false document
5 with DFR when Wood emailed to a DFR investigator a fictitious PA business license for
6 CCS on August 29, 2022.

7 28. Pursuant to ORS 86A.330(2), in addition to and not in lieu of any other penalty
8 provided by law, the Director may impose a civil penalty under ORS 183.745 in an amount
9 of not more than \$5,000 for each instance in which a person violates, aids or abets another
10 person in violating, or procures a violation of ORS 86A.303 to 86A.339.

11 29. Pursuant to ORS 86A.330(1)(a), if the Director determines that a person that
12 services a mortgage loan has violated ORS 86A.303 to 86A.339, the Director may order
13 the person to cease and desist from any act that constitutes such a violation.

14 **ORDERS**

15 The Director issues the following ORDERS:

16 Order to Cease and Desist

17 30. Pursuant to the authority of ORS 86A.330(1)(a), the Director hereby ORDERS
18 Respondents to CEASE AND DESIST from violating ORS 86A.303 to 86A.339.

19 Order Imposing Civil Penalties

20 31. As authorized by ORS 86A.330(2), the Director hereby ORDERS that
21 Respondents be subject, jointly and severally, to a CIVIL PENALTY of \$80,000, which is
22 comprised of \$15,000 for three violation of ORS 86A.306(1), \$15,000 for three violations
23 of ORS 86A.324(2)(a), \$45,000 for nine violations of violation of ORS 86A.324(2)(b), and
24 \$5,000 for one violation of OAR 86A.324(2)(a)(c)(d).

25 ///

26 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

DESIGNATION OF FINAL ORDER

1. This Order is a “Final Order” under ORS 183.310(6)(b). Subject to that provision, the entry of this Order does not limit other remedies that are available to the Director under Oregon law.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 31st day of October 2024.

ANDREW R. STOLFI, Director
Department of Consumer and Business Services

/s/ Dorothy Bean
Dorothy Bean, Chief of Enforcement
Division of Financial Regulation

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO JUDICIAL APPEAL

Judicial review of final orders in contested cases is governed by ORS 183.482. Respondent may request judicial review by filing a petition with the Court of Appeals in Salem, Oregon, within 60 days from the date this order is served.

Division of Financial Regulation
Labor and Industries Building
350 Winter Street NE, Suite 410
Salem, OR 97301-3881
Telephone: (503) 378-4387

