

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 29 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

TATYANA EVGENIEVNA DREVALEVA,

No. 23-15654

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:22-cv-02068-EMC

v.

MEMORANDUM*

NARAYAN TRAVELSTEAD
PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION;
TIMOTHY TRAVELSTEAD, in his
capabilities as a President of the Narayan
Travelstead Professional Law Corporation;
JULIE L. CHO, in her official and individual
capabilities as an Associate Attorney of the
Narayan Travelstead Professional Law
Corporation; ALAMEDA HEALTH
SYSTEM,

Defendants-Appellees.

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

Submitted March 26, 2024**

Before: TASHIMA, SILVERMAN, and KOH, Circuit Judges.

* 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).

Tatyana Evgenievna Drevaleva appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her action alleging federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo the district court's judgment on the pleadings. *Fleming v. Pickard*, 581 F.3d 922, 925 (9th Cir. 2009). We affirm.

In her opening brief, Drevaleva failed to address the grounds for dismissal of her action and has therefore waived any such challenge. *See Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Washington*, 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003) (explaining that “we will not consider any claims that were not actually argued in appellant’s opening brief”).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Drevaleva’s requests for leave to file post-judgment pleadings because the proposed filings were within the scope of the pre-filing order. *See Moy v. United States*, 906 F.2d 467, 469 (9th Cir. 1990) (standard of review); *West v. Proconier*, 452 F.2d 645, 646 (9th Cir. 1971) (concluding that an order refusing to authorize filing of complaint was a “proper exercise of the district court’s authority to effectuate compliance with its earlier order”).

We reject as meritless Drevaleva’s contentions regarding personal jurisdiction and that Judge Chen’s judgment was the result of fraud or criminal conduct.

All pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.