

3. On January 11, 2010, the court denied Plaintiff's motion, without prejudice. The court gave Plaintiff leave to re-notice its motion. The court also indicated:

When the Plaintiff re-files the motion, the court expects to see a verified answer, as required by Delaware law. If Mr. Bunche relies on the papers he filed so far, the court will have little choice but to grant the bank's motion and the foreclosure will move forward.

4. The bank re-noticed its motion for February 5, 2010. In response, Plaintiff filed an assortment of documents, including: a letter from him to the Federal Bureau of Investigation; several documents captioned "Request for Production of Document"; "Notice Of Fraud And Intent To Litigate"; and so on.

5. Based on the complaint and its attachments, a verified answer was required under 10 *Del. C.* § 3901(a).

6. Defendants have not filed a verified answer. Moreover, it does not appear that Mr. Bunche's responses to the complaint and motions for summary judgment were filed in good faith. They are either frivolous or vexatious.

In light of the above, the court finds that a hearing on Plaintiff's

Motion for Summary Judgment would not help decide the motion. Further, it is apparent from the papers, including the lack of a verified answer, that Plaintiff is entitled to relief, and Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: January 29, 2010

/s/ Fred S. Silverman

Judge

oc: Prothonotary (Civil)

pc: Stephen P. Doughty, Esquire

Armae LLC, Pro Se Defendant, via first-class mail

Curtis J. Bunche, Pro Se Defendant, via first-class mail