

SEP 08 2015

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

## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ROBERT LANGERMANN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PATRICIA SEITZ; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 14-15216

D.C. No. 2:11-cv-01438-KJD-  
GWF

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Nevada  
Kent J. Dawson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 25, 2015\*\*

Before: McKEOWN, CLIFTON, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Robert Langermann appeals pro se from the district court's judgment  
dismissing his action arising out of the administration of a class action settlement.

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 district court's order denying a motion to transfer. *Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc.*, 211 F.3d 495, 498 (9th Cir. 2000). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Langermann's motion to transfer this action to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida because Langermann was enjoined from further prosecuting the instant action. *See McCollough v. Johnson, Rodenburg & Lauinger, LLC*, 637 F.3d 939, 953 (9th Cir. 2011) (an abuse of discretion exists only where there is a definite and firm conviction that the district court committed a clear error of judgment).

We reject Langermann's contentions regarding denial of access to courts, the district court's sanction warning, and unequal treatment by the district court and the Eleventh Circuit.

**AFFIRMED.**