NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ROBERT H. GRUNDSTEIN, Esquire, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. LEON GRUNDSTEIN, DBA Gencare, Defendant-Appellee.	No. 15-35762 D.C. No. 2:14-cv-01356-RSL MEMORANDUM[*]

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Robert S. Lasnik, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 25, 2016[**]

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

Robert H. Grundstein appeals pro se from the district court's order denying

his motion for reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) in his

action alleging federal and state law claims involving a trust. We have 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). Thus, Grundstein's request for oral argument, set forth in his opening and reply briefs, is denied.

under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion, *Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1258 (9th Cir. 2010), and we affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Grundstein's Rule 60(b) motion because Grundstein failed to demonstrate any grounds for relief from the district court's judgment. *See Am. Ironworks & Erectors, Inc. v. N. Am. Const. Corp.*, 248 F.3d 892, 899 (9th Cir. 2001) (no abuse of discretion in denial of plaintiffs' Rule 60 motion where the motion "offered no basis for withdrawal of the [challenged] order").

We do not consider Grundstein's contentions as to the district court's May 1, 2015 order. *See Grundstein v. Grundstein*, No. 15-35436 (9th Cir., Sept. 16, 2015) (dismissing appeal from May 1, 2015 order as untimely and explaining that Grundstein's current appeal "will be limited to review of the July 17, 2015 order").

AFFIRMED.