

APR 23 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JANE DOE,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants - Appellees.</p>

No. 12-17239

D.C. No. 4:12-cv-00532-CKJ

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Cindy K. Jorgenson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 16, 2013**

Before: CANBY, IKUTA, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Jane Doe appeals pro se from the district court's order denying her motion for leave to proceed anonymously. We have jurisdiction under the collateral order

* 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).

doctrine. *Does I Thru XXIII v. Advanced Textile Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1058, 1065-67 (9th Cir. 2000). We review for an abuse of discretion. *Id.* at 1069. We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Doe leave to proceed anonymously where there were insufficiently “unusual” circumstances justifying anonymity, and where Doe failed to redact her true name in documents filed in the district court. *Id.* at 1067-68 (a party may proceed anonymously in judicial proceedings only “in special circumstances when the party’s need for anonymity outweighs prejudice to the opposing party and the public’s interest in knowing the party’s identity”).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Doe’s motion for reconsideration because Doe failed to establish a basis warranting reconsideration. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (setting forth standard of review and grounds for reconsideration).

AFFIRMED.