IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA CORP., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:12-cv-00361-RMC
ORAL HEARING REQUESTED

DEFENDANT WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.'S MOTION TO ENFORCE THE CONSENT JUDGMENT

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 57 and 65, and 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. ("Wells Fargo") respectfully moves the Court for an order declaring and enforcing the terms and conditions of the Consent Judgment in this case.

The Consent Judgment incorporates a comprehensive release of Wells Fargo by the United States for certain Wells Fargo liability with respect to its Federal Housing Administration ("FHA") mortgage lending conduct. The United States release specifically includes liability arising under the False Claims Act ("FCA") and the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act ("FIRREA") for Wells Fargo conduct covered by its annual certifications to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") regarding Wells Fargo's compliance with FHA mortgage lending program obligations.

On October 9, 2012, the United States violated the terms and conditions of the Consent Judgment release by filing a new complaint against Wells Fargo in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. *United States v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 12-

cv-7527 (JMF) (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 9, 2012). The New York complaint alleges that Wells Fargo is liable under the FCA and FIRREA based on conduct that was settled through the Consent Judgment and its incorporated release.

In this Motion, Wells Fargo specifically seeks declaratory relief with respect to Wells Fargo's rights under the Consent Judgment and the United States' abrogation of its obligation to release Wells Fargo from certain liability by filing an action in New York, alleging claims under the FCA, FIRREA, and otherwise based on the same annual certification conduct that the United States already released through the Consent Judgment. In addition, Wells Fargo seeks an order enjoining the United States from pursuing causes of action, such as the ones pled in the New York complaint, that are based on annual certification conduct released in the Consent Judgment. Finally, Wells Fargo also seeks other equitable relief to compensate Wells Fargo for the injuries suffered as a result of the repetitive litigation occasioned by the United States' violations of the Consent Judgment.

Prior to filing this Motion, undersigned Wells Fargo counsel conferred with counsel for the United States concerning the claims and relief sought herein. Counsel for the United States advised Wells Fargo that the United States would oppose the Motion.

Wells Fargo respectfully refers the Court to Wells Fargo's accompanying Statement of Points and Authorities for further grounds in support of this Motion.

Wells Fargo requests an oral hearing on this Motion.

WHEREFORE, defendant Wells Fargo hereby prays that the Court grant the relief requested.

Dated: November 1, 2012 Respectfully submitted,

FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON LLP Douglas W. Baruch, DC Bar No. 414354 William F. Johnson, pro hac vice pending

Jennifer M. Wollenberg, DC Bar No. 494895

801 17th Street NW

By /s/ Douglas W. Baruch

Washington, DC 20006-1600 Telephone: (202) 639-7000 Facsimile: (202) 639-7003 Douglas.Baruch@friedfrank.com William.Johnson@friedfrank.com Jennifer.Wollenberg@friedfrank.com

K&L GATES LLP Michael J. Missal, DC Bar No. 367125 Amy Williams, *pro hac vice* 1601 K Street NW Washington, DC 20006-1600 Telephone: (202) 778-9000 Facsimile: (202) 778-9100

Facsimile: (202) 7/8-9100 Michael.Missal@klgates.com Amy.Williams@klgates.com

Attorneys for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.