

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Medford LLC v. U.S. Bank, N.A. and Nathan F. Smith

Medford LLC · No. 1:24-cv-02021-MC · Decided April 15, 2026

OPINION

Medford LLC v. U.S. Bank, N.A. and Nathan F. Smith

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

MEDFORD DIVISION

MEDFORD LLC, Case No. 1:24-cv-02021-MC Plaintiff, OPINION and ORDER v.

U.S. BANK, N.A. and NATHAN F. SMITH,

Defendants. _____ MCSHANE, Judge: This Court previously dismissed Plaintiff's claims for lack of standing. Plaintiff now moves for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1) and asks to file a Second Amended Complaint.¹ Because Plaintiff has not identified a mistake in the Court's standing analysis, Plaintiff's Motion for Relief, ECF No. 43, is DENIED.

BACKGROUND

The parties and the court are familiar with the facts as previously outlined in the litigation of the case. See Dec. 22, 2025, Op. & Order (denying Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order), ECF No. 29; see also Feb. 10, 2026, Op. & Order (denying Plaintiff's Motion for Relief from ECF No. 29), ECF No. 40; Mar. 3, 2026, Op. & Order (granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for lack of standing), ECF No. 41. ¹ The Court understands Plaintiff's Motion to allege a judicial error of law or fact such that it falls within the purview of Rule 60(b)(1). Accordingly, Plaintiff is not entitled to relief under Rule 60(b)(6). *Kemp v. United States*, 596 U.S. 528, 533 (2022) (clarifying Rule 60(b)(6) is only available "when Rules 60(b)(1) through (b)(5) are inapplicable.").

LEGAL STANDARD

A motion for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) is an "'extraordinary remedy' . . . 'not [to] be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances.'" *Novalpina Cap. Partners I GP S.A.R.L. v. Read*, 149 F.4th 1092, 1104 (9th Cir. 2025) (quoting *Carroll v. Nakatani*, 342 F.3d 934, 945 (9th Cir. 2003)). Rule 60(b)(1) allows courts to relieve litigants from a final judgment in the event of "mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1). To succeed on a Rule 60(b)(1) motion, a "plaintiff must show that the district court committed a specific error." *Straw v. Bowen*, 866 F.2d 1167, 1172 (9th Cir. 1989).

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff has not shown that this Court committed a specific error. Plaintiff's Motion attempts to cure the Article III standing defect that the Court previously identified. See Mar. 3, 2026, Op. & Order. But Plaintiff's argument misunderstands the Court's previous decision. In its previous Order, the Court held that Plaintiff lacked standing because Plaintiff could not show traceability. Id. 3–4; see also *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992) (a plaintiff's injury must be fairly traceable to the defendant's challenged conduct). Plaintiff could not show traceability because Plaintiff was the "architect of [its] own injuries." Mar. 3, 2026, Op. & Order 3–4. Plaintiff cannot establish that Defendants' challenged conduct caused its injuries because (1) Plaintiff obtained the property via quitclaim deed after the Owens' mortgage had been in default for a year and (2) Plaintiff does not "dispute that it purchased the property subject to all existing liens and without assuming the burden of the defaulted loan." Id. 4. While Plaintiff's instant Motion and proposed Second Amended Complaint purport to establish standing, they do not address traceability. Instead, Plaintiff simply buttresses the "injury" element required for Article III standing: "[the Second Amended Complaint] attempts to cure [the] defect by alleging a direct property deprivation." Pl.'s Mot. Relief ¶ 13, ECF No. 43. Because Plaintiff once again speaks only to injury and not traceability, Plaintiff does not allege a mistake in the Court's analysis. Absent that, Plaintiff still lacks standing and this Court is without subject matter jurisdiction.

CONCLUSION

Because this Court does not have jurisdiction, Plaintiff's Motion for Relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1), ECF No. 43, is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 15th day of April 2026. ____/s/ Michael McShane ____ Michael McShane United States District Judge