United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit
FILED
November 4, 2026
Thomas B. Plunkett, III
Clerk

No. 25-51076
Summary Calendar

NANCY ALANIS,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, *as Successor Trustee to Bank of America, National Association, as Successor by Merger to LaSalle Bank, N.A., as Trustee for the MLMI Trust Series 2006-HE6*; NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, L.L.C.; PHH MORTGAGE CORPORATION, *Successor By Merger to Ocwen Loan Servicing, L.L.C.*; OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, L.L.C.; WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.; MARK D. CRONENWETT,

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 5:23-CV-749

Before HAYNES, GRAVES, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:[*]

Nancy Alanis appeals from the dismissal of her complaint, which raised several claims stemming from the foreclosure of two properties in San

[*] This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

Antonio—one at 1040 Blanco Road (the "Blanco Property") and another at 13210 Hunters View (the "Hunters View Property"). The district court concluded that all of Alanis's claims were barred by res judicata. That is because it determined that all her claims had already been, or could have been, raised in seven prior lawsuits she brought against the defendants or their privies. On appeal, however, Alanis has forfeited, by failing to brief, any argument that the district court erred by giving preclusive effect to the judgments in those prior cases. *See Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224–25 (5th Cir. 1993). Then, insofar as she argues that the district court lacked jurisdiction to rule on the defendants' motions to dismiss based on the ripeness doctrine, that assertion lacks merit. *See Abbott Lab'ys v. Gardner*, 387 U.S. 136, 148 (1967).

She also challenges the district court's denial of her Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4) motions. Through these motions, Alanis sought relief from two purportedly void state court orders that were entered in prior foreclosure proceedings. Under the circumstances presented here, Rule 60(b)(4) does not provide an avenue for relief from the state court judgments at issue, and the district court did not err by declining to grant the requested relief. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 1; *Callon Petroleum Co. v. Frontier Ins. Co.*, 351 F.3d 204, 208 (5th Cir. 2003).

In light of the foregoing, the district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.

Finally, we note that Alanis has been declared a vexatious litigant in the Western District of Texas, and we have previously affirmed the dismissal of Alanis's similar claims related to the Hunters View Property. *See Alanis v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 22-50246, 2022 WL 17844074, at *1 (5th Cir. Dec. 22, 2022) (per curiam) (unpublished). The instant action is at least the fourth lawsuit that Alanis has filed in state or federal court concerning the

foreclosure of the Blanco Property. Accordingly, Alanis is WARNED that frivolous, repetitive, or otherwise abusive filings will invite the imposition of sanctions, including possible dismissal, monetary sanctions, and restrictions on her ability to file pleadings in this court and any court subject to this court's jurisdiction. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 38; *Coghlan v. Starkey*, 852 F.2d 806, 817 n.21 (5th Cir. 1988) (per curiam).