

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 23 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 21-30190

Plaintiff-Appellee,

D.C. No. 3:13-cr-00044-RRB-1

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

ALAN M. BARTLETT,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Alaska  
Ralph R. Beistline, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 15, 2022\*\*

Before: CANBY, CALLAHAN, and BADE, Circuit Judges.

Alan M. Bartlett appeals pro se the district court's order denying his "Motion to Allow Limited Contact While No-Contact Order is in Effect." We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Bartlett contends that the district court violated his right to due process by

---

\* 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). Appellant's motions for oral argument are, therefore, denied.

denying him permission to contact certain trial witnesses despite a 2015 no-contact order. We disagree. The district court had the authority to issue and maintain the no-contact order, *see Wheeler v. United States*, 640 F.2d 1116, 1123-24 (9th Cir. 1981), and Bartlett has identified no meritorious basis upon which the order should be lifted or modified.

Appellant is informed that the docket is correct.

All pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**