2 3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MODESTA JACINTO, Case No. 16-cv-02815-MMC Plaintiff. ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS ۷. DITECH AND MERS' MOTION TO DISMISS; VACATING HEARING; DITECH FINANCIAL LLC, et al., DISMISSING ACTION Defendants. Re: Dkt. No. 57 12

Before the Court is the "Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint," 13 filed December 1, 2016, by defendants Ditech Financial LLC ("Ditech") and Mortgage 14 15 Electronic Registration Systems, Inc.'s ("MERS") (collectively, "Moving Defendants").<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff Modesta Jacinto ("Jacinto") has filed opposition.<sup>2</sup> to which Moving Defendants 16 have filed a reply. Having read and considered the papers filed in support of and in 17 18 opposition to the motions, the Court deems the matter suitable for decision thereon, 19 VACATES the hearing scheduled for January 6, 2017, and hereby rules as follows. By order filed October 26, 2016, the Court dismissed Jacinto's First Amended 20 21 Complaint ("FAC") in its entirety, and granted Jacinto leave to amend to allege sufficient 22 facts to support four of her seven causes of action. Thereafter, on November 14, 2016, 23 Jacinto filed her Second Amended Complaint ("SAC"). By the instant motion, Moving 24

- <sup>1</sup> A third defendant, National Default Servicing Corporation ("NDSC"), filed a "Declaration of Non-Monetary Status" in state court, and, to date, has not filed any additional documents.
- 27 <sup>2</sup> Although, as Moving Defendants correctly point out, Jacinto's opposition was filed one day late, the Court nonetheless has considered it in ruling on the instant motion. 28

**Northern District of California** United States District Court

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

25

26

Defendants argue, <u>inter alia</u>, that Jacinto has failed to cure the deficiencies previously identified by the Court. As set forth below, the Court agrees.

With respect to Jacinto's First Cause of Action, titled "Violation of Cal. Civ. Code 2924.17," the only new allegations are conclusory in nature (see SAC ¶¶ 73-74), and, further, fail to address, let alone cure, the deficiency previously identified by the Court, specifically, the failure to allege facts to support her conclusory allegation that the amount owed was incorrect.

Similarly, with respect to Jacinto's Second Cause of Action, titled "Violation of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing," the only new allegation is conclusory in nature (<u>see id</u>. ¶ 83), and, further, fails to address, let alone cure, the deficiency previously identified by the Court, specifically, the failure to allege facts to support her conclusory allegation that she was denied the benefits of the loan contract.

Jacinto's Third Cause of Action, titled "Violation of California Bus. & Prof. Code Sections 17200 Et Seq.," is unchanged in any respect, and, consequently, Jacinto has failed to cure the deficiencies previously identified by the Court, specifically, the failure to allege facts to support tolling of the statute of limitations and facts to support her allegation that defendants marketed and funded a predatory loan.

Jacinto's Fourth Cause of Action, titled "Declaratory Relief," likewise is unchanged, and, as said claim is derivative of her § 17200 claim, it fails for the reasons stated above with respect to the Third Cause of Action.<sup>3</sup>

Lastly, as the deficiencies identified above are equally applicable to NDSC, the
SAC is subject to dismissal as against said additional defendant as well. <u>See Silverton v.</u>
<u>Dep't of Treasury</u>, 644 F.2d 1341, 1345 (9th Cir. 1981) (holding, where court grants
motion to dismiss complaint as to one defendant, court may dismiss complaint against
non-moving defendant "in a position similar to that of moving defendants").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In the FAC, the above-referenced four claims were set forth, respectively, as the Third through Sixth Causes of Action.

1		CONCLUSION
United States District Court Northern District of California	2	For the reasons stated above, defendants' motion to dismiss is hereby GRANTED,
	3	and the above-titled action is hereby DISMISSED without further leave to amend. The
	4	Clerk of Court shall close the file.
	5	
	6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
	7	1.
	8	Dated: January 3, 2017 <u>Mafine M. Chelmer</u> MAXINE M. CHESNEY
	9	MAXINE M. CHESNEY United States District Judge
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19 00	
	20	
	21 22	
	22 23	
	23 24	
	24 25	
	25 26	
	20 27	
	28	
		3