

JUL 20 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ROY SUDDUTH,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>JAMES GRIFFIS; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants - Appellees,</p>
--

No. 09-55553

D.C. No. 2:08-cv-04563-PSG-JWJ

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Philip S. Gutierrez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 29, 2009\*\*

Before: ALARCÓN, LEAVY, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Roy Sudduth appeals pro se from the district court’s order dismissing his action alleging, among other things, discrimination based on his race, religion, and disability. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo.

*Sacks v. Office of Foreign Assets Control*, 466 F.3d 764, 770 (9th Cir. 2006). We

---

\* 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).

affirm for the reasons stated by the district court in its orders filed on December 30, 2008 and March 27, 2009.

Contrary to Sudduth's contention, the district court did not abuse its discretion by rejecting his proposed amended complaint after concluding that the filing failed to comply with local rules. *See Delange v. Dutra Constr. Co., Inc.*, 183 F.3d 916, 919 n.2 (9th Cir. 1999) (per curiam) ("District courts have broad discretion in interpreting and applying their local rules.") (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

Sudduth's contention that the district court judges were biased is not supported by the record. *See Taylor v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.*, 993 F.2d 710, 712 (9th Cir. 1993) (adverse rulings alone are insufficient to demonstrate bias).

Sudduth's contention that the district court failed to make reasonable accommodations for his disabilities is also not supported by the record.

We do not consider issues raised for the first time on appeal. *See Foti v. City of Menlo Park*, 146 F.3d 629, 638 (9th Cir. 1998).

Sudduth's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

**AFFIRMED.**