

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 22 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

AROGANT HOLLYWOOD; ALISON  
HELEN FAIRCHILD,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

CARROWS CALIFORNIA FAMILY  
RESTAURANTS, INC.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-55012

D.C. No. 2:18-cv-02098-JGB-GJS

MEMORANDUM\*

AROGANT HOLLYWOOD; ALISON  
HELEN FAIRCHILD,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

PUBLIC STORAGE, INC.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-55013

D.C. No. 5:18-cv-01822-JGB-GJS

AROGANT HOLLYWOOD,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

No. 20-55014

D.C. No. 2:18-cv-05607-JGB-GJS

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA; et al.,  
Defendants-Appellees.

AROGANT HOLLYWOOD; ALISON  
HELEN FAIRCHILD,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

2200 ONTARIO LLC, a California Limited  
Liability Corporation; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-55075

D.C. No. 5:18-cv-01664-JGB-GJS

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Jesus G. Bernal, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 16, 2021\*\*

Before: GRABER, R. NELSON, and HUNSAKER, Circuit Judges.

In these consolidated appeals, Arogant Hollywood and Alison Helen Fairchild appeal pro se from the district court's order declaring them to be vexatious litigants and entering a pre-filing review order against them. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion.

---

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes these cases are suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

*Ringgold-Lockhart v. County of Los Angeles*, 761 F.3d 1057, 1062 (9th Cir. 2014).

We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in declaring Hollywood and Fairchild to be vexatious litigants and entering a pre-filing review order against them after providing notice and an opportunity to be heard, developing an adequate record for review, making substantive findings as to the frivolous and harassing nature of Hollywood and Fairchild's litigation history, and narrowly tailoring the prohibition on future filings. *See id.* (setting forth requirements for pre-filing review orders).

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

Hollywood's opposed motion for an order requiring appellees to re-serve the supplemental excerpts of record is denied. All other pending motions are granted. The Clerk will file Hollywood's corrected reply brief, Hollywood's supplemental brief, Fairchild's supplemental brief, and Fairchild's reply brief.

**AFFIRMED.**