

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 24 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ANDREA CLAIRE WOOD,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

and

TP, a minor child; LIZA LEANO, guardian
ad litem for minor child TP,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, a
government entity; KELLIE CASE, in her
official and individual capacity; EDYTH
WILLIAMS, in her official and individual
capacity; CECELIA GUTIERREZ, in her
official and individual capacity; ERICA
BAINS, in her individual capacity; STATE
OF CALIFORNIA, a government entity;
RAVINDER BAINS, in his individual
capacity; CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF; DAVID O.
LIVINGSTON; ACADIA CHIDI; KIM
JOHNSON; CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES; MARK GHALY,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 21-15085

D.C. No. 3:19-cv-07597-MMC

MEMORANDUM*

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

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Maxine M. Chesney, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 15, 2022**

Before: FERNANDEZ, TASHIMA, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Andrea Claire Wood appeals pro se from the district court's order denying her motion for relief from the judgment. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion the denial of a motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Wood's post-judgment Rule 60(b) motion because Wood failed to establish any grounds for relief. *See id.* at 1263 (setting forth factors for relief from judgment under Rule 60(b)).

We reject as meritless Wood's contentions regarding the merits of her case and that the district court was required to state findings of fact and conclusions of law in its post-judgment order. *See Molloy v. Wilson*, 878 F.2d 313, 315 (9th Cir. 1989) ("An appeal from a denial of a Rule 60(b) motion brings up only the denial of the motion for review, not the merits of the underlying judgment."); *see also*

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

Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a)(3) (“The court is not required to state findings or conclusions when ruling on a motion under Rule 12 or 56 or, unless these rules provide otherwise, on any other motion.”).

Defendants’ motion (Docket Entry No. 18) is granted in part. The Clerk is directed to place under seal the exhibits attached to Wood’s opening brief (Docket Entry No. 8). All other pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.