

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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.