

JAN 10 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

FREDERICK GEORGE CELANI, AKA  
Sidney F. Levine,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

RAINMAKER MANAGED LIVING  
LLC, a New York limited liability  
company; et al.,

Defendants.

JOHN COTTON, Permanent Receiver of  
Rainmaker Managed Living, LLC, a New  
York limited liability company, Rainmaker  
Managed Living, LLC, a California limited  
liability company, and their subsidiaries  
and affiliates,

No. 10-56172

D.C. No. 2:05-cv-06121-SJO-SH

MEMORANDUM\*

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

Receiver.

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

Submitted December 19, 2011\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and McKEOWN, Circuit Judges.

Frederick George Celani appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion to set aside the default judgment in the Securities and Exchange Commission's ("SEC") civil law enforcement action against him. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Brandt v. Am. Bankers Ins. Co. of Fla.*, 653 F.3d 1108, 1110 (9th Cir. 2011). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Celani's motion to set aside the default judgment because Celani failed to present a meritorious defense to the SEC's action. *See Am. Ass'n of Naturopathic Physicians v. Hayhurst*, 227 F.3d 1104, 1108 (9th Cir. 2000) (a district court may deny a motion to set aside a default judgment if the defendant lacks a meritorious defense). We

---

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2)*.

are not persuaded by Celani's contention that he was prejudiced by the district court's failure to await his opposition to the SEC's motion to amend the judgment to reflect Celani's true identity given that Celani does not dispute the accuracy of the amendment.

Celani's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

**AFFIRMED.**