

SEP 25 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff - Appellee,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>REINHOLD V. SOMMERSTEDT,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant - Appellant.</p>

No. 10-17563

D.C. No. 2:06-cv-00273-RCJ-GWF

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada
Robert C. Jones, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 10, 2012**

Before: WARDLAW, CLIFTON, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Reinhold V. Sommerstedt appeals pro se from the district court's order holding him in civil contempt for failing to obey its orders requiring him to file a certification of compliance stating that he notified customers of the underlying

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

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

summary judgment and injunction against him. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion a civil contempt order. *Irwin v. Mascott*, 370 F.3d 924, 931 (9th Cir. 2004). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion when it found Sommerstedt in contempt for his failure to comply with its orders requiring him to file a certification stating his compliance with the underlying injunction’s customer notification requirement. *See id.* (person subject to injunction generally may not contest its lawfulness by disobeying it).

Under the law of the case doctrine, we do not consider Sommerstedt’s challenges to the district court’s underlying summary judgment for the United States or to the resulting injunction’s customer notification requirement. *See Leslie Salt Co. v. United States*, 55 F.3d 1388, 1392 (9th Cir. 1995) (“Under law of the case doctrine, . . . one panel of an appellate court will not reconsider matters resolved in a prior appeal to another panel in the same case.”).

AFFIRMED.