OPINION SUMMARY
MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

DLJ MORTGAGE CAPITAL, INC.,	)	No. ED109090
	)	
Respondent,	)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
	)	of St. Charles County
vs.	)	
	)	
CREATIVE CLIENT RECOVERY, INC., ET AL.,	)	Honorable Jon A. Cunningham
	)	
	)	
Appellants.	)	FILED: November 16, 2021

Creative Client Recovery, Inc. ("CCR") and Ronald Bell, Sr., et al. (the "Bells") (collectively, "Appellants") appeal from the judgment of the trial court in favor of DLJ Mortgage Capital, Inc. ("DLJ") on its claim for judicial foreclosure and on CCR's counterclaims for quiet title and judicial foreclosure (the "2020 Judgment"). CCR raises ten points on appeal, and the Bells raise seven points on appeal. The primary issue on appeal is the priority of competing liens on the subject property. CCR challenges the trial court's grant of judgment on the pleadings to DLJ on CCR's counterclaims, alleging CCR's judgment liens had priority over DLJ's liens. Relatedly, CCR contends the trial court's judgment was vague and indefinite as to other liens on the subject property and failed to acknowledge CCR's interest in its judgment liens.

AFFIRMED IN PART, REVERSED IN PART AND REMANDED WITH INSTRUCTIONS.

DIVISION ONE HOLDS: Because CCR failed to meet its burden to demonstrate that the trial court's judgment resolving the lien priority dispute in favor of DLJ was erroneous, CCR abandoned its argument regarding lien priority in Point One, and the point is denied. Because the trial court's judgment was a valid, final judgment resolving the lien priority dispute and awarding judicical foreclosure on the property, we deny Point Nine. However, because the trial court erred in failing to specify CCR's interest as to its judgment liens, we grant Point Ten. We remand to the trial court with instructions to enumerate CCR's judgments liens, which are entitled to payment from the foreclosure-sale surplus, if any exists. We affirm the trial court's judgment in all other respects. Because the remaining points on appeal lack merit, and a formal, published discussion addressing those points would serve no jurisprudential purpose, a memorandum discussing the points not covered in this opinion has been furnished to the parties pursuant to Rule 84.16(b).

Opinion by: Kurt S. Odenwald, P.J.
Kelly C. Broniec, J., and John P. Torbitzky, J., concur.

Attorneys for Creative Client Recovery, Inc., Appellant: Kevin J. Kasper and Ryan P. Schellert

Attorneys for Ronald E. Bell, Jr., Ronald E. Bell, Sr., Linda Bell, Mary Bell, Chinh Smith, Appellants:	James E. Klenc
Attorneys for Respondent:	Randall F. Scherck and Tali L. Katz

THIS SUMMARY IS NOT PART OF THE OPINION OF THE COURT. IT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE READER AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.