

MAR 04 2011

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>JERRY BULOSAN; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 09-56755

D.C. No. 2:08-cv-03455-PSG-CW

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 15, 2011**

Before: CANBY, FERNANDEZ, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Roy Sudduth appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his action alleging violations of the Fair Housing Act. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion a district court’s denial of a motion for reconsideration. *Sch. Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc., Multnomah Cnty.*,

* 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).

Or., 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Sudduth's "Motion to Vacate All of Judge Gutierrez and Magistrate [Judge] Woehrle's Ex-Parte Orders of Court," because Sudduth has set forth no basis for reconsideration. *See id.* at 1263 (listing grounds for reconsidering earlier ruling).

Sudduth's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

We do not consider whether the district court abused its discretion by dismissing Sudduth's action based on his failure to appear at a scheduled final pretrial conference and failure to cooperate, because Sudduth makes no argument on appeal regarding this issue. *See Miller v. Fairchild Indus., Inc.*, 797 F.2d 727, 738 (9th Cir. 1986).

AFFIRMED.