NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JEFFREY HOFFMAN,

        Appellant,

  v.

THOMAS R. LLOYD,

        Appellee.

No. 12-16898

D.C. No. 3:12-cv-00198-EMC

MEMORANDUM[*]

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Edward M. Chen, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 21, 2015[**]

Before: CANBY, GOULD, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

     Jeffrey Hoffman appeals pro se from the district court's order affirming the

bankruptcy court's order granting sanctions against Hoffman in adversary

proceedings relating to certain real property. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.

§ 158(d). We review for clear error the district court's de novo examination of

---

    [*]   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 cases is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

noncore related proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 157(c). *Henderson v. Buchanan*, 985 F.2d 1021, 1024 (9th Cir. 1993). We affirm.

The district court did not clearly err in its de novo review of the bankruptcy court record. Accordingly, sanctions were proper because Hoffman failed to attend his deposition, failed to oppose Lloyd's motion to strike and for entry of default, and failed to file a motion for relief from the bankruptcy court's ruling after the bankruptcy court advised Hoffman that Lloyd's motion had been granted but that Hoffman could file a motion for relief explaining his conduct. *See Wanderer v. Johnston*, 910 F.2d 652, 656 (9th Cir. 1990) (listing factors that a court should consider in determining the appropriateness of the sanction of dismissal).

We do not consider arguments and allegations raised for the first time in the reply brief, including Hoffman's contentions concerning the damages hearing. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009) (per curiam).

AFFIRMED.