

FEB 19 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

In re DANIEL DAVID DYDZAK,
<hr/>
DANIEL DAVID DYDZAK,
Appellant.

No. 11-56028

D.C. No. 2:10-mc-00270-GHK

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
George H. King, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 11, 2013\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, TASHIMA, and WARDLAW, Circuit Judges.

Daniel David Dydzak appeals pro se from the district court’s order imposing reciprocal discipline on him based on his disbarment from the California State Bar, affirmed by the California Supreme Court. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion, *In re Corrinet*, 645 F.3d 1141, 1145 (9th Cir. 2011), and we affirm.

---

\* 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).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing reciprocal discipline against Dydzak because he failed to establish by clear and convincing evidence that he was deprived of due process; that there was insufficient proof of the misconduct that led to his stipulated suspension from the bar; or that grave injustice would result from the imposition of reciprocal discipline. *See In re Kramer*, 282 F.3d 721, 724-25 (9th Cir. 2002) (listing limited grounds for an attorney subject to discipline by another court to avoid a federal court's imposition of reciprocal discipline, and setting forth attorney's burden); *see also In re Rosenthal*, 854 F.2d 1187, 1188 (9th Cir. 1988) (per curiam) (state court factual findings are entitled to a presumption of correctness absent a showing of error).

We do not address the denial of Dydzak's motion for disqualification of Judge King because Dydzak merely raised the issue in his brief without supporting it with any argument. *See Am. Int'l Enters., Inc. v. FDIC*, 3 F.3d 1263, 1266 n.5 (9th Cir. 1993).

Dydzak's contentions regarding the district court's docket are unpersuasive.

Dydzak's requests for judicial notice and a stay of appellate proceedings, set forth in his opening brief, are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**