

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 2 2015

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MICHAEL A. LEON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FIONA GRIEG, an individual;
UNKNOWN PARTIES,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 13-15997

D.C. No. 4:13-cv-00289-DCB

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
David C. Bury, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 17, 2015**

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, LEAVY, and FERNANDEZ, Circuit Judges.

Michael A. Leon appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his diversity action alleging that defendants made false statements about him in violation of state law. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

* 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).

We review de novo whether the district court had subject matter jurisdiction.

Munoz v. Mabus, 630 F.3d 856, 860 (9th Cir. 2010). We affirm.

Leon is correct that the district court had diversity jurisdiction over his action based on allegations that Leon and the only named defendant, Fiona Grieg, reside in different states, and Leon seeks over \$75,000 in damages. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) (requirements for diversity jurisdiction).

Leon fails to raise any other issues on appeal and, therefore, we affirm. *See Pierce v. Multnomah County, Or.*, 76 F.3d 1032, 1037 n.3 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not supported by argument in pro se brief are deemed abandoned); *Greenwood v. FAA*, 28 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 1994) (“We review only issues which are argued specifically and distinctly in a party’s opening brief.”).

All pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.