

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 28 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CECILE ANDREA BROWN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

JOHN C. COUGHENOUR, U.S. District
Court Judge; UNITED STATES DISTRICT
JUDGES CHAMBERS,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 21-35428

D.C. No. 2:21-cv-00662-MJP

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Marsha J. Pechman, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 19, 2021**

Before: SCHROEDER, SILVERMAN, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Cecile Andrea Brown appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing her action alleging constitutional claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th

* 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).

Cir. 2012) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)); *Meek v. County of Riverside*, 183 F.3d 962, 965 (9th Cir. 1999) (dismissal on the basis of judicial immunity). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Brown's action because Judge Coughenour is entitled to judicial immunity. *See Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11-12 (1991) (judicial immunity and its limited exceptions).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Brown's motion for reconsideration because Brown failed to establish any basis for relief. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (standard of review and grounds for reconsideration).

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

AFFIRMED.