NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

APR 24 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

BRITTANY ANN STILLWELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal entity,

Defendant,

and

ONNI REAL ESTATE IX, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; ONNI REAL ESTATE HOLDINGS, LTD., a Canadian limited corporation; KIMBALL TIREY & ST. JOHN, LLP, a Louisiana Debt Collection Agency; CHRIS JAMES EVANS, an individual,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-6422

D.C. No. 2:22-cv-09426-JWH-JC

MEMORANDUM*

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

---

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

Submitted April 22, 2026[**]

Before: LEE, DESAI, and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

Brittany Ann Stillwell appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her action alleging various federal and state law violations related to a landlord-tenant dispute. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. *Pickern v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.), Inc.*, 457 F.3d 963, 968 (9th Cir. 2006). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Stillwell's action because, despite two opportunities to amend, Stillwell's operative complaint failed to comply with Rule 8. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) (a pleading must contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief"); *Nevijel v. N. Coast Life Ins. Co.*, 651 F.2d 671, 674 (9th Cir. 1981) (explaining that a complaint that is "verbose, confusing and conclusory" violates Rule 8).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing without leave to amend because amendment would be futile. *See Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 656 F.3d 1034, 1041 (9th Cir. 2011) (setting forth standard of review and explaining that dismissal without leave to amend is proper when amendment

[**] The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

would be futile); *Metzler Inv. GMBH v. Corinthian Colls., Inc.*, 540 F.3d 1049, 1072 (9th Cir. 2008) (explaining that "the district court's discretion to deny leave to amend is particularly broad where plaintiff has previously amended the complaint" (citation omitted)).

We reject as meritless Stillwell's contention that the district court violated her due process rights.

AFFIRMED.