

NOV 20 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>SCOTIA GROUP MGT. LLC; GREENS AT VENTANA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiffs - Appellees,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>JUNE E. WILLEMS,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant - Appellant.</p>
---

No. 11-16901

D.C. No. 2:04-sc-01414-SMM

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
Stephen M. McNamee, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 13, 2012\*\*

Before: CANBY, TROTT, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

June E. Willems appeals pro se from the district court’s order denying her motion for reconsideration of its judgment dismissing her putative qui tam action.

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of

---

\* 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).

discretion, *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993), and we affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Willems's motion for reconsideration because Willems failed to establish grounds for relief under either Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) or 60(b). *See id.* at 1263 (discussing factors to consider for reconsideration or relief from judgment under Rule 59(e) and 60(b)).

Willems' waived her due process claim by raising it for the first time on appeal, *see Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009) (per curiam), and her arguments regarding service of process and subject matter jurisdiction are not supported by the record.

**AFFIRMED.**