

JUN 22 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ROBERT J. JAFFE,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>DAVID P. YAFFE, The Honorable, in his Judicial and individual capacities; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>

No. 08-55013

D.C. No. 2:06-cv-08094-DDP-JTL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Dean D. Pregerson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 25, 2010**

Before: CANBY, THOMAS, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Robert J. Jaffe appeals pro se from the district court's order rejecting Jaffe's
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) motion. We have jurisdiction under 28

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 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 for an abuse of discretion the district court's decision regarding the management of its case. *Muckleshoot Tribe v. Lummi Indian Tribe*, 141 F.3d 1355, 1358 (9th Cir. 1998). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by rejecting Jaffe's Rule 60(b) motion. The rejection was consistent with this court's mandate upon summarily affirming the district court's order dismissing Jaffe's suit for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *See Palomo v. Baba*, 497 F.2d 959, 960 (9th Cir. 1974) (per curiam) (recognizing that any orders by a district court following issuance of the mandate must be consistent "as to all matters encompassed by the mandate").

We decline to address Jaffe's contentions regarding the underlying dismissal of his case.

AFFIRMED.