

1	On October 3, 2012, Lawyers Title filed a motion to dismiss based on <i>res judicata</i> . Dkt.
2	13. Lawyers Title claims that
3	This is the fourth frivolous lawsuit filed by Plaintiff concerning real property located at 10717 State Route 162 E., Puyallup, WA 98374 ("Subject
4	Property"). The three prior cases were filed in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington at Tacoma under Case No. CV-10-5148-RBL,
5	Case No. CV-10-5884-RBL, and Case No. CV-11-5442-RBL. After dismissing frivolous claims in all three of these matters, Judge Leighton entered an Order on
6	August 30, 2011, warning Plaintiff "any future frivolous filings by Mr. Stewart on the subjects of this lawsuit may result in the imposition of sanctions." (Dkt. No 13 – ORDER filed under Case No. CV-11-5442-RBL).
7	Id. at 1–2. On October 19, 2012, Stewart responded. Dkt. 13. On October 24, 2012, Lawyers
8	Title replied. Dkt. 19.
9	II. DISCUSSION
10	Motions to dismiss brought under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
11	may be based on either the lack of a cognizable legal theory or the absence of sufficient facts
12	alleged under such a theory. Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Department, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th
13	Cir. 1990). Material allegations are taken as admitted and the complaint is construed in the
14	plaintiff's favor. Keniston v. Roberts, 717 F.2d 1295, 1301 (9th Cir. 1983). To survive a motion
15	to dismiss, the complaint does not require detailed factual allegations but must provide the
16	grounds for entitlement to relief and not merely a "formulaic recitation" of the elements of a
17	cause of action. Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1965 (2007). Plaintiffs must
18	allege "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Id. at 1974. In the
19	event the court finds that dismissal is warranted, the court should grant the plaintiff leave to
20	amend unless amendment would be futile. Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d
	1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003).
21	Quiet title actions are "designed to resolve competing claims of ownership [or]
22	

1	the right to possession of real property." Kobza v. Tripp, 105 Wn.App. 90, 95 (2001).
2	Washington's statute governing quiet title actions recognizes that a deed of trust creates only a
3	secured lien on real property, and does not convey any ownership interest or right to possess the
4	subject property. RCW 7.28.230(1).
5	In this case, Stewart requests that the Court quiet title in his name to property that has
6	already been foreclosed upon. Stewart has failed to show that he has, or will ever have, a
7	competing claim to ownership in the property in question. Therefore, the Court grants Lawyers
8	Title's motion to dismiss. The Court dismisses the complaint with prejudice against all parties
_	because any amendment would be futile.
9	III. ORDER
10	Therefore, it is hereby ORDERED that Lawyers Title's motion to dismiss (Dkt. 13) is
11	GRANTED . The Clerk is directed to remove all pending motions from the Court's calendar and
12	close this case.
13	Dated this 6 th day of November, 2012.
14	
15	$L \Lambda C$
16	Depr / Sattle
17	BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge
18	
19	
20	
20	
22	