Case: 13-14298 Date Filed: 10/28/2014 Page: 1 of 8

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT No. 13-14298 Non-Argument Calendar D.C. Docket No. 1:13-cv-02703-SCJ, Bkcy No. 13-bkc-59123-MGC In Re: BELINDA TOLBERT BROWN, Debtor. BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., Plaintiff-Appellant, versus BELINDA TOLBERT BROWN, Defendant-Appellee.

> No. 13-14438 Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 4:13-cv-00209-HLM, Bkcy No. 13-bkc-41719-PWB

Case: 13-14298 Date Filed: 10/28/2014 Page: 2 of 8

RANDALL LEE MADDE BARBARA LYNN MADI	
	Debtors.
BANK OF AMERICA, N.	A.,
	Plaintiff-Appellant,
versus	
RANDALL LEE MADDE BARBARA LYNN MADI	
	Defendants-Appellees.
	No. 13-14908 Non-Argument Calendar
D.C	. Docket No. 1:13-cv-03050-SCJ, Bkcy No. 13-bkc-60912-JRS
In Re: BETTY JEAN BOY	KINS,
	Debtor.
BANK OF AMERICA BA	.NK. NA.
	Plaintiff-Appellant,
	riamum-rippemant,

Case: 13-14298 Date Filed: 10/28/2014 Page: 3 of 8

1/	ersu	ıç
v	$c_{1}$	L,

BETTY JEAN BOYK	INS.
-----------------	------

Defendant-Appellee. No. 13-15839 Non-Argument Calendar D.C. Docket No. 1:13-cv-03853-JEC, Bkcy No. 12-bkc-81760-WLH IN RE: PAMELA FAE PEELE, Debtor.

BANK OF AMERICA BANK, NA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

PAMELA FAE PEELE,

Defendant-Appellee.

No. 14-10137 Non-Argument Calendar

Case: 13-14298 Date Filed: 10/28/2014 Page: 4 of 8

## D.C. Docket No. 1:13-cv-04141-WBH, Bkcy No. 13-bkc-68483-BEM

In Re: TONI RENEE HA	MILTON-PRESHA,
	Debtor.
BANK OF AMERICA, N	T.A.,
	Plaintiff-Appellant,
versus	
TONI RENEE HAMILTO	ON-PRESHA,
	Defendant-Appellee.
	No. 14-11012 Non-Argument Calendar
D.C	C. Docket No. 1:14-cv-00355-JEC, Bkcy No. 13-bkc-74836-BEM
In Re: ILYA BELOTSER	KOVSKY,
	Debtor.
ILYA BELOTSERKOVS	KY,
	Plaintiff-Appellee.

Case: 13-14298 Date Filed: 10/28/2014 Page: 5 of 8

versus	
BANK OF AMERICA, N	.A.,
	Defendant-Appellant.
	No. 14-11387 Non-Argument Calendar
	Docket No. 1:13-cv-04076-WSD, Bkcy No. 13-bkc-64749-BEM
BEVERLY JOHNSON,	
	Debtor.
BANK OF AMERICA, N	.A.,
	Plaintiff-Appellant,
versus	
BEVERLY JOHNSON,	
	Defendant-Appellee.

No. 14-11676 Non-Argument Calendar Case: 13-14298 Date Filed: 10/28/2014 Page: 6 of 8

D.C. Docket No. 1:13-cv-03405-ODE, Bkcy No. 13-bkc-60795-BEM

In Re: ROSA LILIANA GARRO,

Debtor.

BANK OF AMERICA BANK, NA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

ROSA LILIANA GARRO,

Defendant-Appellee.

\_\_\_\_\_

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia

\_\_\_\_\_

(October 28, 2014)

Before ED CARNES, Chief Judge, JORDAN and ROSENBAUM, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM:

The following facts are undisputed. The appellees filed voluntary petitions for bankruptcy under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code. In their petitions, they reported that their homes were subject to two mortgage liens. In every case, appellant Bank of America, N.A. held the second-priority mortgage liens. In every case, the value of the home was less than the balance of the senior lienholder's

Case: 13-14298 Date Filed: 10/28/2014 Page: 7 of 8

mortgage. Each petitioner sought a determination from the bankruptcy court that Bank of America's junior mortgage lien was wholly unsecured and, therefore, void under 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and (d). The bankruptcy court granted each motion.

Bank of America appealed in every case and the district court affirmed every time.

Bank of America brought separate appeals to this Court. The appellees filed motions to consolidate the appeals, which this Court granted. Bank of America filed a motion for initial hearing en banc, which this Court denied.

When the district court affirms the bankruptcy court's order, we review only the bankruptcy court's decision on appeal. <u>Educ. Credit Mgmt. Corp. v. Mosley</u>, 494 F.3d 1320, 1324 (11th Cir. 2007). We review <u>de novo</u> the bankruptcy court's legal conclusions. <u>Hemar Ins. Corp. of Am. v. Cox</u>, 338 F.3d 1238, 1241 (11th Cir. 2003).

In <u>Folendore v. United States Small Bus. Admin.</u>, 862 F.2d 1537 (11th Cir. 1989), we held that an allowed claim that is wholly unsecured — just as Bank of America's claims are here — is voidable under the plain language of section 506(d). <u>Id.</u> at 1538–39. Bank of America contends that the Supreme Court's decision in <u>Dewsnup v. Timm</u>, 502 U.S. 410, 112 S.Ct. 773 (1992), abrogated our <u>Folendore</u> decision. Bank of America concedes, however, that "[u]nder our prior panel precedent rule, a later panel may depart from an earlier panel's decision only when the intervening Supreme Court decision is 'clearly on point.'" <u>Atl. Sounding</u>

Case: 13-14298 Date Filed: 10/28/2014 Page: 8 of 8

Co., Inc. v. Townsend, 496 F.3d 1282, 1284 (11th Cir. 2007). Bank of America also concedes that our decision in In re McNeal, 735 F.3d 1263 (11th Cir. 2012), held that the Supreme Court's decision in Dewsnup is not clearly on point because it "disallowed only a 'strip down' of a partially secured mortgage lien and did not address a 'strip off' of a wholly unsecured lien." Id. at 1265. Our Folendore and McNeal decisions control this case.

## AFFIRMED.