

MAR 08 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

In re: JUNE E. WILLEMS,

Debtor,

JUNE E. WILLEMS,

Appellant,

v.

RALPH E. SEEFELDT, Chapter 7  
Trustee,

Appellee.

No. 10-15489

D.C. No. 4:09-cv-00413-RCC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
Raner C. Collins, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 15, 2011\*\*

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

---

\* 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).

June E. Willems appeals pro se from the district court's judgment affirming the bankruptcy court's summary judgment vacating its discharge of her bankruptcy proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d). We review de novo. *Zurich Am. Ins. Co. v. Int'l Fibercom, Inc. (In re Int'l Fibercom, Inc.)*, 503 F.3d 933, 939 (9th Cir. 2007). We affirm.

Contrary to Willems's contentions, the bankruptcy court properly concluded that it had jurisdiction to hear her bankruptcy case. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(1) ("Bankruptcy judges may hear and determine all cases under title 11"); D. Ariz. Gen. Order 01-15 ("Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(a), the court hereby refers to the bankruptcy judges for this district all cases under title 11 and all proceedings under title 11 . . . .").

Willems's contentions that she was denied due process by the bankruptcy and district courts are not supported by the record. *See SEC v. McCarthy*, 322 F.3d 650, 659 (9th Cir. 2003) (due process requires notice and an opportunity to be heard).

Willems's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

Willems's pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**