

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 7 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

FAREED SEPEHRY-FARD,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

GREENPOINT MORTGAGE FUNDING,
INC.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 14-16264

D.C. No. 5:13-cv-04535-EJD

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Edward J. Davila, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 25, 2016**

Before: LEAVY, GRABER, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Fareed Sepehry-Fard appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his quiet title action. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo the district court's dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

* 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).

Crum v. Circus Circus Enters., 231 F.3d 1129, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Sepehry-Fard's action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because Sepehry-Fard failed to allege facts sufficient to show any violation of federal law or diversity of citizenship in his complaint. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332(a); *Yokeno v. Mafnas*, 973 F.2d 803, 807-08 (9th Cir. 1992) (analyzing whether plaintiff's complaint presented a "substantial federal question"); *Kuntz v. Lamar Corp.*, 385 F.3d 1177, 1181-83 (9th Cir. 2004) (addressing diversity of citizenship under § 1332).

We do not consider any claims that Sepehry-Fard did not properly raise before the district court. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

Sepehry-Fard's contentions that the district court violated his right to due process are unpersuasive.

In light of our disposition, we do not address the merits of Sepehry-Fard's claims.

Sepehry-Fard's pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.