NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STEPHEN S. EDWARDS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

PHH MORTGAGE CORPORATION; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 19-15997

D.C. No. 2:18-cv-04040-SPL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Arizona Steven Paul Logan, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 2, 2020**

Before: LEAVY, PAEZ, and BENNETT, Circuit Judges.

Stephen S. Edwards appeals from the district court's judgment dismissing

his action alleging federal and state law claims arising out of the foreclosure

proceedings on his property. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We

review de novo a district court's dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure

FILED

JUN 9 2020

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

^{*} 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).

12(b)(6). *Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 656 F.3d 1034, 1040 (9th Cir. 2011). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Edwards's action because Edwards failed to allege facts sufficient to state any plausible claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (to avoid dismissal, "a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

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).

PHH Mortgage Corporation's request for fees and costs on appeal set forth in its answering brief is denied without prejudice to the filing of a timely bill of costs and motion for attorney's fees under Fed. R. App. P. 39 and 9th Cir. R. 39-1.

AFFIRMED.