

NOV 13 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

DONATA HARDY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES; BART
LANDSMAN; LOS ANGELES POLICE
DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 12-55442

D.C. No. 2:10-cv-02243-JAK-RZ

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
John A. Kronstadt, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted November 6, 2013
Pasadena, California

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, GRABER, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

Donata Hardy appeals a jury's verdict that she failed to prove by preponderance of the evidence that Bart Landsman, a former officer in the Los Angeles Police Department, violated her constitutional rights when arresting her

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

for solicitation of prostitution. She contends the district court erred in various evidentiary rulings and by denying her motion for a new trial.

Hardy challenges the district court's refusal to admit impeachment evidence as not probative, less probative than prejudicial, or improper character evidence. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 403; 404. The district court had "considerable latitude" in making its evidentiary decisions, and we will not disturb its rulings. *See Rogers v. Raymark Indus., Inc.*, 922 F.2d 1426, 1430 (9th Cir. 1991).

Hardy maintains the district court abused its discretion when it concluded that defense counsel did not violate an evidentiary stipulation. Any error in this regard was harmless and does not require reversal.

Finally, Hardy argues that the district court erred by denying her a new trial, but there was sufficient evidence to support the jury's verdict and the district court made no reversible mistakes of law. *See EEOC v. Go Daddy Software, Inc.*, 581 F.3d 951, 962 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.