

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 12 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

DONALD K. BRANDT; TZIPORA
BRANDT,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 19-55471

D.C. No. 2:18-cv-08545-VAP-
AFM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Virginia A. Phillips, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 6, 2020**

Before: BERZON, N.R. SMITH, and MILLER, Circuit Judges.

Donald K. Brandt and Tzipora Brandt appeal pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing their action alleging federal and state law claims arising out of the foreclosure of their property. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*,

* 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).

341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed the Brandts’ action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because it is a “de facto appeal” of prior state court decisions and raises claims that are “inextricably intertwined” with those decisions. *See id.* at 1163-65 (discussing *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine).

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).

AFFIRMED.