FILED

APR 28 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUSTIN RINGGOLD-LOCKHART and NINA RINGGOLD, Plaintiffs - Appellants, v. MYER J. SANKARY; et al., Defendants - Appellees.	No. 11-57247 D.C. No. 2:09-cv-09215-R-RC MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Manuel L. Real, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 9, 2015**
Pasadena, California

Before: REINHARDT, McKEOWN, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

The Appellants, Nina Ringgold and Justin Ringgold-Lockhart, appeal from the district court's order denying their motion for relief from judgment. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

---

* 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 may only review a district court's ruling on a Rule 60(b) motion for abuse of discretion. *Browder v. Dir., Dep't of Corr. of Ill.*, 434 U.S. 257, 263 n.7 (1978). The Appellants sought relief from the final order on the basis of newly discovered evidence, namely a May 23, 2011 letter of the California Commission on Judicial Performance. The letter was not relevant to the district court's conclusion that the action was barred under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. It was therefore not an abuse of discretion to conclude that the discovery of the letter did not warrant relief from judgment.

The district court did not err by not granting the Appellants leave to amend their complaint. Amendment would have been futile in this case because it was clear that there was no basis for subject matter jurisdiction.

We deny the Appellants' motion for judicial notice (Dkt. No. 71).

AFFIRMED.