

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 6 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ALVIN E. WILLIAMS; JUDITH M.
BROWN-WILLIAMS,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

BENTLEY MOTORS, INC.; RUSNAK
PASADENA,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-56317

D.C. No. 2:12-cv-05685-GW-JCG

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
George H. Wu, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 26, 2017**

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

Alvin E. Williams and Judith M. Brown-Williams appeal pro se from the district court's order denying their post-judgment motion for reconsideration in their action alleging federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying appellants' fourth motion for reconsideration because appellants failed to establish any basis for such relief. *See id.* at 1262-63 (setting forth grounds for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)).

Appellants' pending motions (Docket Entry Nos. 22, 23, and 24) are denied.

AFFIRMED.