

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 28 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ALISON LORRAINE HATHEWAY,

No. 20-16126

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:19-cv-05610-DLR

v.

MEMORANDUM*

AILEEN DEFEO,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Douglas L. Rayes, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 20, 2021**

Before: THOMAS, Chief Judge, TASHIMA and SILVERMAN, Circuit Judges.

Alison Lorraine Hatheway appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing her action alleging federal and state law claims arising out of foreclosure proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo the district court's sua sponte dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil

* 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).

Procedure 12(b)(6). *Omar v. Sea-Land Serv., Inc.*, 813 F.2d 986, 991 (9th Cir. 1987). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Hatheway’s action sua sponte after giving Hatheway “notice of its sua sponte intention to invoke Rule 12(b)(6) and afford[ing her] an opportunity to . . . submit a written memorandum in opposition to such motion[.]” *Wong v. Bell*, 642 F.2d 359, 362 (9th Cir. 1981) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted); *see also Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (to avoid dismissal, “a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

AFFIRMED.