

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 25 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ROBERT RIDLEY,

No. 21-56007

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:19-cv-07783-PSG-SS

v.

MEMORANDUM*

BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION;
EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS,
INC.; TRANSUNION CORP.; DOES, 1
through 5,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Philip S. Gutierrez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 18, 2023**

Before: GRABER, PAEZ, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Robert Ridley appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for relief from judgment under Rule 60(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse

* 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).

of discretion. *Riley v. Filson*, 933 F.3d 1068, 1071 (9th Cir. 2019). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Ridley’s motion, which was filed more than fourteen months after the order dismissing his action, because it was not filed within a reasonable time. *See Bynoe v. Baca*, 966 F.3d 972, 979 (9th Cir. 2020) (setting forth the requirements for a Rule 60(b)(6) motion, including that the motion must be filed “within a reasonable time”).

AFFIRMED.