

1	The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's Complaint and Defendants' Motion. Courts in this
2	district have routinely rejected "show-me-the-note" claims. See, e.g., Mikhay v. Bank of Am.,
3	NA., 2011 WL 167064, *2–*3 (W.D. Wash. 2011); Wright v. Accredited Home Lenders, 2011
4	WL 39027 (W.D. Wash. 2011); Pelzel v. First Saving Bank Northwest, 2010 WL 3814285, at *2
5	(W.D. Wash. 2010); Wallis v. IndyMac Fed. Bank, 717 F. Supp. 2d 1195, 1200 (W.D. Wash.
6	2010); Freeston v. Bishop, White & Marshall, P.S., 2010 WL 1186276, at *6 (W.D. Wash.
7	2010). Indeed, the Washington Deed of Trust Act requires that a foreclosing lender demonstrate
8	its ownership of the underlying note to the trustee, not to the borrower. RCW 61.24.030(7).
9	Accordingly, Plaintiff's show me the note claim fails to state a claim and Defendant's
10	Motion to Dismiss it is GRANTED and the claim is DISMISSED with prejudice.
11	Plaintiff's claim for injunctive relief is moot—the property has already been foreclosed
12	and sold at the trustee's sale. That claim too is DISMISSED with prejudice. Because all claims
13	have been dismissed, the Clerk shall enter judgment in Defendant's favor and terminate the case.
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.
15	Dated this 21 st day of May, 2013.
16	
17	RONALD B. LEIGHTON
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	