

APN# 1318-23-610-048

Recording Requested by/Mail to:

Name: Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP

Address: 8985 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 200

City/State/Zip: Las Vegas, NV 89123

Mail Tax Statements to:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

MEMORANDUM

Title of Document (required)

Please complete the Affirmation Statement below:

The undersigned hereby affirms that the document submitted for recording DOES contain personal information as required by law: (check applicable)


Affidavit of Death – NRS 440.380 (1)(A) & NRS 40.525 (5)

Military Discharge – NRS 419.020 (2)

Other NRS _____ (state specific law)

-OR-

I the undersigned hereby affirm the attached document, including any exhibits, hereby submitted for recording does NOT contain the personal information of any person(s). (Per NRS 239B.030)



Signature

Brody R. Wight

Printed Name

This document is being (re-)recorded to correct document # _____, and is correcting

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 30 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JOEL BECK,

No. 23-15203

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:22-cv-00225-MMD-CLB

v.

MEMORANDUM*

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC, DBA
Mr. Cooper; WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,
as Trustee Securitized Trust Structured;
FIRST AMERICAN TRUSTEE
SERVICING SOLUTIONS, LLC,

A TRUE COPY
MOLLY C. DWYER
Clerk of Court
ATTEST

MAY 08 2024

Defendants-Appellees.

by: *Joan Ryan*
Deputy Clerk

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada
Miranda M. Du, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2024**

Before: CALLAHAN, LEE, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Joel Beck appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging a due process claim arising from state court proceedings. We have

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Beck's action as barred by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because it amounted to a forbidden "de facto appeal" of a prior state court judgment and raised a constitutional claim that was "inextricably intertwined" with that judgment. *See id.* at 1163-65 (discussing proper application of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine); *see also Benavidez v. County of San Diego*, 993 F.3d 1134, 1142 (9th Cir. 2021) (explaining that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine applies even where the challenge to the state court decision involves federal constitutional issues); *Reusser v. Wachovia Bank, N.A.*, 525 F.3d 855, 860 (9th Cir. 2008) (*Rooker-Feldman* doctrine bars a claim of extrinsic fraud if the alleged fraud has been separately litigated in a state action).

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

All pending requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.