

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 24 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

KEVIN PAUL WOODRUFF, AKA Wanag
Tahatan-Bey; TANYA STUTSON,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

BARRETT DAFFIN FRAPPIER TREDER
& WEISS, LLP; UNREGISTER FOREIGN
BAR BRITISH AGENTS; COUNTY OF
CONTRA COSTA; DEBORAH COOPER;
CANDACE ANDERSON; DAVID O.
LIVINGSTON,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 22-15926

D.C. No. 4:21-cv-06862-SBA

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Richard Seeborg, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 18, 2023**

Before: SCHROEDER, RAWLINSON, and BADE, Circuit Judges.

Kevin Paul Woodruff and Tanya Stutson appeal pro se from the district

* 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).

court's judgment dismissing their action relating to the foreclosure of their home. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). *Puri v. Khalsa*, 844 F.3d 1152, 1157 (9th Cir. 2017). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed plaintiffs' action because plaintiffs failed to allege facts sufficient to state a plausible claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (to avoid dismissal, "a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)); *Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001) (courts are not required to accept as true allegations that "contradict matters properly subject to judicial notice or exhibit" or allegations that are "merely conclusory, unwarranted deductions of fact, or unreasonable inferences").

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration because plaintiffs set forth no valid grounds for reconsideration. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (setting forth standard of review and grounds for reconsideration under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59).

Plaintiffs' motion to extend the time to file a reply brief (Docket Entry No.

12) is denied as unnecessary.

AFFIRMED.