

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 1 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ALEX BAAH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

AT&T INC.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-55515

D.C. No. 8:15-cv-02008-JLS-JCG

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Josephine L. Staton, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 18, 2021\*\*

Before: CANBY, FRIEDLAND, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Alex Baah appeals pro se from the district court's April 27, 2020 post-judgment order denying his motion for relief from judgment in his employment action. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255,

---

\* 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).

1262 (9th Cir. 1993). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying reconsideration because Baah failed to demonstrate any basis for relief. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), 60(b)-(d); *Sch. Dist. No. 1J*, 5 F.3d at 1262-63 (setting forth grounds for reconsideration).

We do not consider the district court's post-judgment orders (1) denying Baah's motion for disqualification and (2) denying reconsideration of the order denying disqualification, because the notice of appeal is untimely as to those orders. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A) (notice of appeal must be filed with the district clerk within 30 days after entry of judgment or order appealed from).

We do not consider Baah's contentions concerning his prior appeals, Nos. 16-56793 and 18-56358.

**AFFIRMED.**