

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JUL 30 2015

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

DUE HAU TRAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 13-56420

D.C. No. 2:13-cv-02195-MWF-
MRW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Michael W. Fitzgerald, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 21, 2015**

Before: CANBY, BEA, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Due Hau Tran appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for attorney's fees and costs following his successful motion to remand.

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse 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 case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

discretion a denial of fees and costs. *Lussier v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc.*, 518 F.3d 1062, 1065 (9th Cir. 2008). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Tran’s motion for attorney’s fees and costs because the Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles had an objectively reasonable basis to remove Tran’s action, as the complaint contained allegations concerning violations of federal laws. *See Martin v. Franklin Capital Corp.*, 546 U.S. 132, 141 (2005) (discussing when attorney’s fees should be awarded under 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) and explaining that absent unusual circumstances, “when an objectively reasonable basis [for removal] exists, fees should be denied”).

We reject Tran’s contentions that further efforts to meet and confer would have been futile, and that the district court was required to determine whether Tran’s requested fees and costs were reasonable.

AFFIRMED.