

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 16 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ANTHONY OLIVER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

JAMIE MICHELLE LUNER; DOES, 1-10,
inclusive,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 18-56306

D.C. No. 2:18-cv-02562-VAP-
AFM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Virginia A. Phillips, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 9, 2020**

Before: THOMAS, Chief Judge, TASHIMA and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Anthony Oliver appeals pro se from the district court's post-judgment order declaring him a vexatious litigant and requiring pre-filing review. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Ringgold-Lockhart v. County of Los Angeles*, 761 F.3d 1057, 1062 (9th Cir. 2014).

* 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).

We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by declaring Oliver a vexatious litigant and entering a pre-filing review order against him because all of the requirements for entering a pre-filing review order were met. *See id.* at 1062 (setting forth requirements for pre-filing review orders).

To the extent Oliver challenges the underlying judgment dismissing his action, we do not consider his contentions because they are outside the scope of this appeal.

We reject as without merit Oliver's contentions that the district court later amended the vexatious litigant order to add a bond requirement, that the district court lacked authority to enter the vexatious litigant order sua sponte, and that Oliver was entitled to a hearing.

AFFIRMED.