

NOV 12 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ANDREW J. TASHJIAN,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOUMNA J. FERNANDEZ, AKA
Ghenwa Habbas, AKA Gina Habbas;
YOUMNA GHAMLOUCHE,

Defendants,

And

RABIH S. KHALIFE, Sr.,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 12-55967

D.C. No. 2:99-cv-11621-RNB

MEMORANDUM*

ANDREW J. TASHJIAN,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOUMNA J. FERNANDEZ, AKA
Ghenwa Habbas, AKA Gina Habbas;
RABIH S. KHALIFE, Sr.,

No. 12-56052

D.C. No. 2:99-cv-11621-RNB

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

Defendant,

And

YOUMNA GHAMLOUCHE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Consuelo B. Marshall, Senior District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 5, 2013**
Pasadena, California

Before: GOODWIN, FISHER, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Rabih Khalife, Sr. and Youmna Ghamlouche appeal the district court’s order denying: (1) Khalife’s motion to set aside a renewal of judgment; and (2) Ghamlouche’s motion to vacate that renewal. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291 and affirm.

Khalife’s and Ghamlouche’s attacks on the form of Andrew Tashjian’s pro se renewal application have no support in circuit law. *Blaisdell v. Frappiea*, 729 F.3d 1237, 1241 (9th Cir. 2013) (liberal-construction rule “relieves pro se litigants from the strict application of procedural rules and demands that courts not hold missing or inaccurate legal terminology or muddled draftsmanship against them”).

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

To the extent that the district court amended the docket to reflect its intent to renew judgment against Khalife and Ghamlouche, the court did not abuse its discretion under Rule 60(a). *See Garamendi v. Henin*, 683 F.3d 1069, 1078-80 (9th Cir. 2012); *Blanton v. Anzalone*, 813 F.2d 1574, 1577 (9th Cir. 1987). Khalife and Ghamlouche provide no valid grounds for vacating the renewal of judgment. *See Fidelity Creditor Serv., Inc. v. Browne*, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 854, 858 (Ct. App. 2001).

AFFIRMED.