

SEP 4 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>LANA K. WILLIAMS,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>REX LEE HUHA; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 13-15343

D.C. No. 1:12-cv-01888-AWI-GSA

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Anthony W. Ishii, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 26, 2014\*\*

Before: THOMAS, OWENS, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Lana K. Williams appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing her action alleging state law claims in connection with a car accident.

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, *Carolina Cas. Ins. Co. v. Team Equip., Inc.*, 741

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

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

F.3d 1082, 1086 (9th Cir. 2014), and we affirm.

The district court properly determined there was no federal question jurisdiction because Williams’ action, which alleged state law claims for personal injury, legal malpractice, and insurance bad faith, does not arise “under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 1331; *see also* *Provincial Gov’t of Marinduque v. Placer Dome, Inc.*, 582 F.3d 1083, 1086-87 (9th Cir. 2009) (discussing requirements for federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331).

The district court also properly determined that Williams failed to allege federal jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship because both plaintiff and several defendants are citizens of California. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1); *Kuntz v. Lamar Corp.*, 385 F.3d 1177, 1181 (9th Cir. 2004) (§ 1332 requires complete diversity of citizenship).

We reject Williams’ contention that the district court should not have dismissed her case for equitable reasons.

Williams’ request filed on August 19, 2013 is denied.

**AFFIRMED.**