

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 18 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JOSE LUIS BOBADILLA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

SECURITY NATIONAL MORTGAGE
COMPANY, a Utah corporation - Lender; et
al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-56152

D.C. No. 2:20-cv-05732-PSG-ADS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Philip S. Gutierrez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 8, 2021**

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and MILLER, Circuit Judges.

Jose Luis Bobadilla appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing defendants Security National Mortgage Company ("SNMC") and National Mortgage Servicing Corporation ("NDSC") from his action alleging

* 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).

federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion the district court’s dismissal under its local rules. *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Bobadilla’s claims against SNMC and NDSC after Bobadilla failed to file a timely opposition to these defendants’ motions to dismiss as required by the district court’s local rules. *See id.* at 53-54 (factors to consider before dismissing an action for failure to follow a district court’s local rules; where the district court does not make explicit findings concerning the factors, “we review the record independently to determine whether [it] abused its discretion”); *see also King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987), *overruled on other grounds by Lacey v. Maricopa County*, 693 F.3d 896 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc) (pro se litigants are held to same procedural rules as other litigants).

We reject as meritless Bobadilla’s contentions that the district court judge was biased against him.

AFFIRMED.