

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 5 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

In re: PELI POPOVICH HUNT,

No. 16-56784

Debtor.

D.C. No. 2:15-cv-09342-DDP

PELI POPOVICH HUNT,

MEMORANDUM*

Appellant,

v.

ELISSA D. MILLER; PETER P.
ANDERSON,

Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Dean D. Pregerson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 26, 2017**

Before: PAEZ, BEA, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Peli Popovich Hunt appeals pro se from the district court's order affirming

* 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).

the bankruptcy court's order granting the chapter 7 trustee's motion to pay mediation costs from estate funds. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d). We review de novo the district court's decision on appeal from the bankruptcy court and apply the same standards of review applied by the district court. *In re Thorpe Insulation Co.*, 677 F.3d 869, 879 (9th Cir. 2012). We affirm.

In the opening brief, Hunt fails to address how the bankruptcy court erred in approving the chapter trustee's motion for disbursement of estate funds to pay certain mediation costs. As a result, Hunt has waived her challenge to the bankruptcy court's order. *See Smith v. Marsh*, 194 F.3d 1045, 1052 (9th Cir. 1999) (“[O]n appeal, arguments not raised by a party in its opening brief are deemed waived.”); *Greenwood v. FAA*, 28 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 1994) (“We review only issues which are argued specifically and distinctly in a party's opening brief.”).

All pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.