	<b>NOT FOR PUBLICATION</b> UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS			
			OCT 26 2018 MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK	
FOR THE NINTH				
VERNON DECK,		No. 17-16680		
	Plaintiff-Appellant,	D.C. No. 2:17-cv-0	0234-MCE-KJN	
Association Mortgage	FARGO BANK, N.A., National on, as Trustee for Option One 2 Loan Trust 2003-1, Asset-Backed es, Series 2003-1; et al.,	MEMORANDUM*	۶	
	Defendants-Appellees.			
	Appeal from the United St for the Eastern Distric Morrison C. England, Jr., Dis Submitted October	t of California strict Judge, Presiding	5	
Before:	SILVERMAN, GRABER, and C	OULD, Circuit Judges.		
Ve	rnon Deck appeals pro se from the d	istrict court's judgme	ent dismissing	
his action	alleging violations of the Fair Debt	Collection Practices	Act, the	

**FILED** 

18 California Homeowner Bill of Rights Act ("HBOR"), and other state law claims

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

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

arising out of foreclosure proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.
 § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal for lack of statutory standing. *Nat'l Council of La Raza v. Cegavske*, 800 F.3d 1032, 1039 (9th Cir. 2015). We review
 for clear error the district court's underlying factual determinations. *Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm. v. Thornburgh*, 970 F.2d 501, 506 (9th Cir. 1991). We
 reverse and remand.

7 The district court did not commit clear error in finding, following an 8 evidentiary hearing, that Deck did not sign the note relating to a refinance loan. 9 See id. at 506. The district court erred, however, in finding that Deck lacked 10 standing to sue for violations of HBOR because he was not a signatory to the note. 11 HBOR defined a "borrower" as "any natural person who is a mortgagor or trustor 12 and who is potentially eligible for any federal, state, or proprietary foreclosure 13 prevention alternative program offered by, or through, his or her mortgage servicer." Cal. Civ. Code § 2920.5 (repealed Jan. 1, 2018). Because it is 14 undisputed that Deck is a trustor under the deed of trust securing the refinance 15 16 loan, we reverse and remand for further proceedings on Deck's claims under 17 HBOR only.

We do not consider defendants' alternative arguments concerning the merits
of Deck's claims under the HBOR, or the effect, if any, of the 2018 repeal of the
specific statutory violations alleged.

2

- 1 We do not consider matters not raised before the district court, or matters not
- 2 specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v.*
- 3 Wright, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).
- 4 Deck's request for judicial notice (Docket Entry No. 26) is granted.
- 5 **REVERSED and REMANDED.**