

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 24 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RALPH W. HUYCK,

No. 20-36093

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 4:19-cv-00035-RRB

v.

MEMORANDUM*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Alaska

Ralph R. Beistline, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 17, 2023**

Before: CLIFTON, R. NELSON, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

Ralph W. Huyck appeals pro se from the district court's post-judgment order denying his motion for reconsideration in his action seeking to enjoin the collection by levy of taxes, penalties and interest for the tax years 2002 and 2004 through 2006. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an

* 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).

abuse of discretion. *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Huyck's motion for reconsideration because Huyck failed to establish any basis for such relief. *See* D. Alaska L. Civ. R. 7.3(h) (setting forth grounds for reconsideration under local rules); *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (setting forth grounds for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and 60(b)).

We do not consider Huyck's contention regarding the district court's grant of summary judgment because it is outside the scope of this appeal.

We reject as unsupported by the record Huyck's contention that the district court was biased against him.

AFFIRMED.