

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 28 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

LA SHAUNA M. GRIFFIN,

No. 23-55512

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 8:21-cv-00981-DOC-JDE

v.

MEMORANDUM*

LOS ANGELES COUNTY; FRANCISCA CAMPBELL, Administrative Services Manager III; AMERICA RODRIGUEZ, Administrative Services Manager II; ALEX MEDINA, Administrative Services Manager I; ALMA YOUNG, Administrative Services Manager I; LUISA BARRETO, Management Analyst; CRISTINA ROSALES, Administrative Services Manager I; KIMBERLY GREEN, Administrative Services Manager I; PAMELA FONTENOT, Administrative Services Manager II; YVETTE MENDOZA, Intermediate Clerk; ROSA MURO, Administrative Services Manager I,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
David O. Carter, District Judge, Presiding

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

Submitted February 21, 2024**

Before: FERNANDEZ, NGUYEN, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

La Shauna M. Griffin appeals pro se from the district court's order granting leave to amend her second amended complaint in her federal employment law action. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

We lack jurisdiction to review the district court's order granting Griffin leave to amend her second amended complaint because the order is not final or appealable. *See WMX Tech., Inc. v. Miller*, 104 F.3d 1133, 1135-37 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc) (dismissal of complaint with leave to amend is not appealable); *cf. Serine v. Peterson*, 989 F.2d 371, 372 (9th Cir. 1993) (order) ("Rule 4(a)(2) permits a notice of appeal from a nonfinal decision to operate as a notice of appeal from the final judgment only when a district court announces a decision that *would be* appealable if immediately followed by the entry of judgment." (citation omitted)).

All pending motions are denied as moot.

DISMISSED.

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