

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 19 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JUN DAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MARK D. WALDRON, Chapter 7 Trustee;  
POTOMAC LAW GROUP, PLLC; GIGA  
WATT BANKRUPTCY ESTATE,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-2924

D.C. No.

2:24-cv-00334-SAB

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Washington  
Stanley Allen Bastian, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 19, 2026\*\*

Before: CLIFTON, FRIEDLAND, and BENNETT, Circuit Judges.

In this appeal, pro se Plaintiff-Appellant Jun Dam appeals the district court's order granting Defendants-Appellees' motion to dismiss Dam's appeal of the bankruptcy court's approval of Potomac Law Group, PLLC's final fee application.

---

\* 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).

We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

Dam's opening brief states that "[t]he contingency fee award challenged in this appeal is wholly derivative of issues currently pending in Case No. 25-2459." His opening brief then makes one argument—that success in his appeal in case number 25-2459 would require reversal here. Our concurrently filed memorandum disposition in case number 25-2459 directs the district court to dismiss Dam's claims without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Dam's sole argument for reversal in the present appeal therefore fails.

Dam has waived all other issues by failing to address them in his opening brief. *See SNJ Ltd. v. Comm'r*, 28 F.4th 936, 944 n.7 (9th Cir. 2022).

All pending motions in this appeal are denied as moot.

**AFFIRMED.**