

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 7 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GREGORY BROWN; BROWN &  
CHARBONNEAU, LLP; DOES 4-100,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-7101

D.C. No. 8:23-cv-01283-DOC-KES

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
David O. Carter, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2026\*\*

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

Jane Doe appeals pro se from the district court's post-judgment order denying her motion for reconsideration in her action alleging state law claims arising out of a contract for legal representation. We have jurisdiction under 28

---

\* 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).

U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Doe’s motion for reconsideration because Doe failed to establish any basis for relief. *See id.* at 1262-63 (setting forth grounds for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Doe’s contentions related to the district court’s judgment dismissing the action because Doe did not timely appeal from that judgment. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a) (notice of appeal must be filed within 30 days of the entry of judgment); *Stratton v. Buck*, 697 F.3d 1004, 1007 (9th Cir. 2012) (“Where there is no separate judgment, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(7)(A)(ii), we deem the entry of judgment to be 150 days after the entry of an appealable final order.”); *Tillman v. Ass’n of Apartment Owners of Ewa Apartments*, 234 F.3d 1087, 1089 (9th Cir. 2000) (“The court of appeals lacks jurisdiction to decide an appeal if the notice of appeal is not timely filed.”).

In light of this disposition, we do not consider the district court’s order denying Doe’s motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order. *See Santa Monica Nativity Scenes Comm. v. City of Santa Monica*, 784 F.3d 1286, 1291 n.1 (9th Cir. 2015).

We do not consider arguments and allegations raised for the first time on

appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

All pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**