

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 22 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

In Re: YAN SUI,

Debtor,

YAN SUI; PEI-YU YANG,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

RICHARD A. MARSHACK, Chapter 7
Trustee; MARSHACK HAYS WOOD,
LLP, a law firm; PAUL M. KRUSEY,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-2425

D.C. No. 8:24-cv-00279-JAK

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
John A. Kronstadt, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 15, 2025**

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Yan Sui and Pei-Yu Yang appeal pro se from the district court's order

* 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).

striking their notices of appeal and dismissing their bankruptcy appeal pursuant to a vexatious litigant pre-filing order. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d). We review for an abuse of discretion the district court's application of a vexatious litigant pre-filing order. *In re Fillbach*, 223 F.3d 1089, 1090 (9th Cir. 2000). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Sui and Yang's appeal because Sui and Yang failed to comply with the pre-filing order previously entered against them in 2018. *See Weissman v. Quail Lodge, Inc.*, 179 F.3d 1194, 1197 (9th Cir. 1999) ("District courts have the inherent power to file restrictive pre-filing orders against vexatious litigants with abusive and lengthy histories of litigation. Such pre-filing orders may enjoin the litigant from filing further actions or papers unless he or she first meets certain requirements" (citation omitted)); *Yan Sui v. Marshack*, No. 13-cv-01607 JAK-KES, 2018 WL 5276300, at *5-7 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 9, 2018) (prefiling order).

We reject as meritless Sui and Yang's contentions that the district court violated their due process rights.

We do not consider Sui and Yang's challenges to the 2018 prefiling order or orders issued in the bankruptcy and adversary proceedings because these orders are outside the scope of this appeal.

AFFIRMED.