UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

NOV 7 2016

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

FAREED SEPEHRY-FARD,	No. 14-16264
Plaintiff-Appellant,	D.C. No. 5:13-cv-04535-EJD
v.	
GREENPOINT MORTGAGE FUNDING, INC.; et al.,	MEMORANDUM[*]
Defendants-Appellees.	

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Edward J. Davila, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 25, 2016[**]

Before: LEAVY, GRABER, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Fareed Sepehry-Fard appeals pro se from the district court's judgment

dismissing his quiet title action. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We

review de novo the district court's dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

---

[*] 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).

Crum v. Circus Circus Enters., 231 F.3d 1129, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Sepehry-Fard's action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because Sepehry-Fard failed to allege facts sufficient to show any violation of federal law or diversity of citizenship in his complaint. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332(a); *Yokeno v. Mafnas*, 973 F.2d 803, 807-08 (9th Cir. 1992) (analyzing whether plaintiff's complaint presented a "substantial federal question"); *Kuntz v. Lamar Corp.*, 385 F.3d 1177, 1181-83 (9th Cir. 2004) (addressing diversity of citizenship under § 1332).

We do not consider any claims that Sepehry-Fard did not properly raise before the district court. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

Sepehry-Fard's contentions that the district court violated his right to due process are unpersuasive.

In light of our disposition, we do not address the merits of Sepehry-Fard's claims.

Sepehry-Fard's pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.