

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 26 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

VICTOR M. SAMANIEGO; BERTHA
ALICIA SAMANIEGO,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

LAW OFFICES OF LES ZIEVE ET. AL.; et
al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-56354

D.C. No. 3:19-cv-01582-TWR-
BGS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Todd W. Robinson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 17, 2021**

Before: SILVERMAN, CHRISTEN, and LEE, Circuit Judges.

Victor M. Samaniego and Bertha Alicia Samaniego appeal pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing their action alleging federal and state law claims arising from the foreclosure of their home. We have jurisdiction under 28

* 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).

U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed the Samaniegos' action because the action constitutes a forbidden "de facto appeal" of a prior state court judgment and raises claims that are "inextricably intertwined" with that judgment. *Id.* at 1163-65 (discussing proper application of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine); *see also Henrichs v. Valley View Dev.*, 474 F.3d 609, 616 (9th Cir. 2007) (*Rooker-Feldman* barred plaintiff's claim because the relief sought "would require the district court to determine that the state court's decision was wrong and thus void").

AFFIRMED.