

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CARTER BRYANT, an individual,

Plaintiff,

and

**MATTEL, INC., a Delaware
corporation; MATTEL DE MEXICO
S.A. DE C.V.,**

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

and

**MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC., a
California corporation; MGA
ENTERTAINMENT (HK) LIMITED, a
Hong Kong Special Administrative
Region business entity; MGAE DE
MEXICO, S.R.L. DE C.V., a Mexico
business entity; ISAAC LARIAN,**

Defendants - Appellees,

v.

**CRUM & FORSTER SPECIALTY
INSURANCE COMPANY,**

No. 11-56868

D.C. No. 2:04-cv-09049-DOC-
RNB

MEMORANDUM*

* This disposition isn't appropriate for publication and isn't precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

Intervenor - Appellant,

**CARLOS GUSTAVO MACHADO
GOMEZ; OMNI 808 INVESTORS,
LLC; IGWT 826 INVESTMENTS,
LLC,**

Defendants,

and

**NATIONAL UNION FIRE
INSURANCE COMPANY OF
PITTSBURGH, PA; LEXINGTON
INSURANCE COMPANY; CHARTIS
SPECIALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY,**

Intervenors.

CARTER BRYANT, an individual,

Plaintiff,

**MATTEL, INC., a Delaware
corporation; MATTEL DE MEXICO
S.A. DE C.V.,**

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

and

**MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC., a
California corporation; MGA
ENTERTAINMENT (HK) LIMITED, a**

No. 11-56881

D.C. No. 2:04-cv-09049-DOC-
RNB

**Hong Kong Special Administrative
Region business entity; MGAE DE
MEXICO, S.R.L. DE C.V., a Mexico
business entity; ISAAC LARIAN,**

Defendants - Appellees,

v.

**NATIONAL UNION FIRE
INSURANCE COMPANY OF
PITTSBURGH, PA; LEXINGTON
INSURANCE COMPANY; CHARTIS
SPECIALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY,**

Intervenors - Appellants,

**CARLOS GUSTAVO MACHADO
GOMEZ; OMNI 808 INVESTORS,
LLC; IGWT 826 INVESTMENTS,
LLC,**

Defendants,

**CRUM & FORSTER SPECIALTY
INSURANCE COMPANY,**

Intervenor.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
David O. Carter, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted December 10, 2012

Pasadena, California

Before: **KOZINSKI**, Chief Judge, **TROTT** and **WARDLAW**, Circuit Judges.

“The filing of a notice of appeal is an event of jurisdictional significance—it confers jurisdiction on the court of appeals and divests the district court of its control over those aspects of the case involved in the appeal.” Griggs v. Provident Consumer Disc. Co., 459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982) (per curiam). The district court’s judgment determined the entire action and included an award of attorneys’ fees. Mattel’s subsequent notice of appeal divested the district court of its jurisdiction; the district court thus lacked jurisdiction to entertain appellants’ motion to intervene. See Nicol v. Gulf Fleet Supply Vessels, Inc., 743 F.2d 298, 299 (5th Cir. 1984). We therefore affirm the denial of intervention, but do so on the ground that the district court lacked jurisdiction to entertain any such motion.

AFFIRMED.