

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 6 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MICHAEL A. BRUZZONE,

No. 22-15157

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:22-mc-80001-WHA

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

INTEL CORPORATION,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
William Alsup, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 15, 2022\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, WATFORD, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Michael A. Bruzzone appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing his qui tam action under a prefiling vexatious litigant order. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *In re Fillbach*, 223 F.3d 1089, 1090-91 (9th Cir. 2000). We affirm.

---

\* 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).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by rejecting Bruzzone's proposed filing and dismissing his action because the filing was within the scope of the district court's prefiling vexatious litigant order. *See Weissman v. Quail Lodge, Inc.*, 179 F.3d 1194, 1197 (9th Cir. 1999) ("District courts have the inherent power to file restrictive pre-filing orders against vexatious litigants with abusive and lengthy histories of litigation. Such pre-filing orders may enjoin the litigant from filing further actions or papers unless he or she first meets certain requirements, such as obtaining leave of the court . . . ." (internal citation omitted)).

We reject as without merit Bruzzone's contention that the district judge should have recused himself from this action.

**AFFIRMED.**