

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 19 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RICHARD LEE GRAFF,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CITIMORTGAGE, INC.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 18-55841

D.C. No. 2:17-cv-03439-FMO-PJW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Fernando M. Olguin, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 12, 2019**

Before: LEAVY, BEA, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Richard Lee Graff appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his federal and state law claims arising out of foreclosure proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion a district court's ruling regarding compliance with its local rules. *See*

* 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).

Bias v. Moynihan, 508 F.3d 1212, 1223 (9th Cir. 2007). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by striking Graff's motion for leave to amend his second amended complaint because Graff failed to comply with the local rules. *See* C.D. Cal. R. 15-1, C.D. Cal. R. 52-4; *Bias*, 508 F.3d at 1223 (explaining that we give "[b]road deference" to a district court's application of its local rules). The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying leave to amend because amendment would have been futile. *See AmerisourceBergen Corp. v. Dialysist W., Inc.*, 465 F.3d 946, 949, 951 (9th Cir. 2006) (setting forth standard of review and explaining that leave to amend can be denied if amendment would be futile).

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.