

DEC 27 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>FAYYAZ RAJA and KATHLEEN RAJA,</p> <p>Plaintiffs - Appellants,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS INC.;</p> <p>et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>

No. 10-15707

D.C. No. 2:09-cv-00650-KJD-LRL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada
Kent J. Dawson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 14, 2010**

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Fayyaz and Kathleen Raja appeal pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing their diversity action arising out of foreclosure proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion the

* 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).

denial of leave to amend and the denial of a motion for reconsideration. *Smith v. Pac. Props. & Dev. Corp.*, 358 F.3d 1097, 1100 (9th Cir. 2004); *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying the Rajas leave to amend after concluding that amendment would be futile. *See Chased v. Fleer/Skybox Int'l, LP*, 300 F.3d 1083, 1087-88 (9th Cir. 2002).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying the Rajas' motion for reconsideration, which was based on disagreements they had with their attorney over their opposition to the motion to dismiss, where the Rajas made no objection during the three months between their attorney's withdrawal and the district court's judgment. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or.*, 5 F.3d at 1262-63 (setting forth requirements for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and 60).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by granting defendants' motion to expunge after dismissing the Rajas' action. *See Peacock v. Thomas*, 516 U.S. 349, 356 (1996) (a federal court has inherent power to enforce its judgments).

The Rajas' remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

AFFIRMED.