

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 9 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MICHAEL SCOTT McDONALD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LOS ANGELES OFFICE OF THE  
DISTRICT ATTORNEY - POMONA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 24-342

D.C. No. 2:23-cv-04461-ODW-KES

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Otis D. Wright, II, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 19, 2025\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, HURWITZ, and BADE, Circuit Judges.

Michael Scott McDonald appeals pro se from the district court's order striking post-judgment filings in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Ready Transp.*,

---

\* 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)*.

*Inc. v. AAR Mfg., Inc.*, 627 F.3d 402, 403-04 (9th Cir. 2010). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in striking McDonald's post-judgment filings or denying his motion for default judgment as moot because McDonald submitted them after the district court had dismissed McDonald's action and closed the case. *See id.* at 404 (holding that district courts have the inherent power to control their dockets, including the power to strike filings from the docket).

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

All pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**