

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 21 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

KATHRYN MARIE SEIDLER,

No. 24-1489

Plaintiff - Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:23-cv-00816-JLR

v.

MEMORANDUM*

AMAZON.COM, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
James L. Robart, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 17, 2025**

Before: CANBY, R. NELSON, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Kathryn Marie Seidler appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her employment action alleging various federal and state law claims.

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Seidler's motion to

* 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).

stay proceedings because Seidler failed to demonstrate a basis for relief. *See Dependable Highway Express, Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007) (setting forth standard of review and explaining that a district court abuses its discretion in denying a stay only if it bases its ruling on an erroneous view of the law or on a clearly erroneous assessment of evidence).

Contrary to Seidler’s contentions, the district court did not err by failing to grant equitable relief, because the district court dismissed Seidler’s claims. We reject as unsupported by the record Seidler’s contention that the district court denied her due process.

We do not consider the district court’s dismissal of Seidler’s action because Seidler did not address the district court’s grounds for dismissal in her opening brief. *See Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Washington*, 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[W]e will not consider any claims that were not actually argued in appellant’s opening brief.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

We do not consider arguments and allegations raised for the first time on appeal or documents not presented to the district court. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Elias*, 921 F.2d 870, 874 (9th Cir. 1990).

Seidler’s motion to seal Docket Entry No. 61.2 (Docket Entry No. 80) is granted. Any provisionally sealed documents will remain under seal. All other

pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.