FILED
10/28/2026
ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

HAROLD S. CORREOS,
Appellant,
vs.
RAMIR M. HERNANDEZ; ARNOLD L. GRAFF; WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP; DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY; WESTERN PROGRESSIVE NEVADA INC.; ALTISOURCE SOLUTIONS, INC.; AND ONITY F/K/A PHH MORTGAGE CORP. F/K/A OCWEN,
Respondents.

No. 90808-COA

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

Harold S. Correos appeals from a district court order granting a motion to dismiss a complaint seeking to quiet title to real property. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Hon. Tara D. Clark Newberry, Judge.

In March 2025, Harold Correos, proceeding pro se, filed an amended complaint to quiet title to real property. He sued creditors and companies associated with the mortgage on his home and their attorneys. Respondents moved to dismiss the amended complaint, arguing that Correos' claims were barred by claim and issue preclusion because he sought identical relief to that sought in prior lawsuits. They further contended that Correos failed to meet basic notice pleading standards. Lastly, they argued that the claims against the attorney defendants were barred by the litigation privilege. Correos opposed the motion. The district court subsequently granted the motion. This appeal followed.

Correos argues that he was denied due process in both state district court and federal bankruptcy court because those courts "fail[ed] to compel presentment of requisite proof of claim," and alleged that the courts improperly excluded evidence and witnesses and ignored judicial notice. He also largely reiterates his claims against respondents. Specifically, he asserts that the contract was fatally flawed from inception by concealment and fraud; the mortgage documents were improperly bifurcated, securitized, and unlawfully reassigned several times; the current mortgage document holders are not holders in due course; and the mortgage documents' chain of custody was broken and contaminated with fraudulent filings, thus voiding the mortgage. Correos also contends that respondents engaged in fraudulent conversion by violating federal and state lending laws.

This court reviews a district court order granting a motion to dismiss on the basis of issue or claim preclusion de novo. *See Alcantara ex rel. Alcantara v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 130 Nev. 252, 256, 321 P.3d 912, 914 (2014) (reviewing application of issue and claim preclusion de novo); *Buzz Stew, LLC v. City of North Las Vegas*, 124 Nev. 224, 227-28, 181 P.3d 670, 672 (2008) (reviewing grant of motion to dismiss de novo).

Here, as discussed above, the district court determined that Correos' allegations were barred by issue and claim preclusion, were inadequately pleaded, and were barred by the litigation privilege. However, Correos does not present cogent argument challenging the district court's determinations. As a result of these omissions, Correos has forfeited challenges to the district court's bases for dismissing his complaint on appeal. *See Edwards v. Emperor's Garden Rest.*, 122 Nev. 317, 330 n.38, 130 P.3d 1280, 1288 n.38 (2006) (providing that this court need not consider issues that are not supported by cogent argument); *Palmieri v. Clark County*, 131 Nev. 1028,

1033 n.2, 367 P.3d 442, 446 n.2 (Ct. App. 2015) (providing that arguments not raised on appeal are deemed forfeited); *see also Hung v. Genting Berhad*, 138 Nev. 547, 547, 513 P.3d 1285, 1286 (Ct. App. 2022) (holding that "when a district court provides alternative bases to support its ultimate ruling, and an appellant fails to challenge the validity of each alternative basis on appeal," this court will generally affirm the judgment). Accordingly, Correos fails to demonstrate he is entitled to relief. Thus, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.[1]

Bulla, C.J.

Gibbons, J.

Westbrook, J.

cc: Hon. Tara D. Clark Newberry, District Judge
Wright, Finlay & Zak, LLP/Las Vegas
Harold S. Correos
Eighth District Court Clerk

[1]Insofar as Correos raises arguments that are not specifically addressed in this order, we have considered the same and conclude that they do not present a basis for relief. To the extent Correos seeks relief from federal district court decisions, such an argument is not properly presented in this appeal.