

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 24 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

LAURIE THORSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HAWAII PUBLIC HOUSING  
AUTHORITY; HAKIM OUANSAFI,  
HPHA Executive Director; RYAN  
AKAMINE, HPHA Chief Compliance  
Officer; LYLE MATSUURA, HPHA  
Supervisor IV,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-1999

D.C. No. 1:23-cv-00412-MWJS-  
WRP

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Hawaii  
Micah W.J. Smith, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 16, 2024\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, VANDYKE, and KOH, Circuit Judges.

Laurie Thorson appeals pro se from the district court's order denying her motion for a preliminary injunction in her action alleging discrimination and

---

\* 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).

retaliation under the Fair Housing Act. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We review for an abuse of discretion. *Am. Trucking Ass'ns, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Thorson's motion for a preliminary injunction because Thorson failed to establish the requirements for such relief. *See id.* (plaintiff seeking preliminary injunction must establish that she is likely to succeed on the merits, she is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the balance of equities tips in her favor, and an injunction is in the public interest).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Thorson's post-judgment motion because Thorson failed to establish 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 standard of review and grounds for reconsideration under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) and 60(b)).

Thorson's motion for judicial notice (Docket Entry No. 22) is denied as unnecessary.

**AFFIRMED.**