NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

AUG 22 2023

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

ARELIOUS REED, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., DBA Wells Fargo Dealer Services, Inc., Defendant-Appellee.	No. 22-55837 D.C. No. 2:21-cv-07545-JVS-MRW MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
James V. Selna, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 15, 2023**

Before: TASHIMA, S.R. THOMAS, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Arelious Reed appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging various federal and state law claims regarding an automobile loan. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion a dismissal for failure to comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of

---

* 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).

Civil Procedure. *McHenry v. Renne*, 84 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 1996). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Reed's action because, despite two opportunities to amend, Reed failed to allege the elements of any claim or explain how any of his allegations related to any of his asserted causes of action. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) (requiring that a pleading contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief").

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Reed's motion for reconsideration because Reed failed to demonstrate any basis for relief. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (setting forth the standard of review and grounds for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and 60(b)).

AFFIRMED.