

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION

To be cited only in accordance with
Fed. R. App. P. 32.1

United States Court of Appeals

**For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted August 28, 2014*

Decided August 29, 2014

Before

DIANE P. WOOD, *Chief Judge*

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

KENNETH F. RIPPLE, *Circuit Judge*

No. 14-1954

AMINA SHEIKHANI,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

WELLS FARGO BANK, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Northern District of Illinois,
Eastern Division.

No. 13 C 7716

Samuel Der-Yeghiayan,
Judge.

ORDER

In an earlier case, Amina Sheikhanı’s husband (purportedly acting as her “nominee”) sued Wells Fargo Bank under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, see 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692–1692p, and Illinois common law. The suit challenged a state foreclosure judgment that had led to the sale of Sheikhanı’s house.

* After examining the briefs and record, we have concluded that oral argument is unnecessary. Thus, the appeal is submitted on the briefs and record. See FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

The district court dismissed that case for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. See *Dist. of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 486 (1983); *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 416 (1923). We upheld the dismissal. *Sheikhani v. Wells Fargo Bank*, 526 F. App'x 705 (7th Cir. 2013). Five months later Sheikhani herself sued Wells Fargo and several additional defendants, once more invoking § 1983 and the FDCPA. Concluding that Sheikhani again sought to challenge the foreclosure judgment, the district court applied *Rooker-Feldman* and dismissed the suit. Sheikhani moved for leave to amend her complaint, but the court denied her request as futile.

Sheikhani appeals from that denial, asserting that the district court abused its discretion by not allowing her to amend her complaint. But the court was right that *Rooker-Feldman* blocks federal suits that attack state-court judgments, see *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005); *Arnold v. KJD Real Estate, LLC*, 752 F.3d 700, 704–05 (7th Cir. 2014), and Sheikhani does not dispute that her suit mounts such an attack. Her briefs on appeal, and the amended complaint she wants to file, aim squarely at the foreclosure judgment. She contends, based on alleged “breaches” of a pooling and servicing agreement, that “[t]he Foreclosing entity was not the true owner of the loan” and that it lacked standing to foreclose. *Rooker-Feldman* puts that dispute outside the district court’s jurisdiction.

AFFIRMED.