

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 30 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

BEOM SU LEE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

TV CHOSUN CORP., DBA TV Chosun; et
al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 23-55450

D.C. No. 2:22-cv-00933-DSF-KS

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted April 22, 2024**

Before: CALLAHAN, LEE, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Beom Su Lee appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing for lack of personal jurisdiction his copyright infringement action. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2). *Axiom Foods, Inc. v. Acerchem Int'l, Inc.*, 874

* 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).

F.3d 1064, 1067 (9th Cir. 2017). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Lee’s action for lack of personal jurisdiction because Lee failed to allege facts sufficient to establish that defendants had such continuous and systematic contacts with California to establish general personal jurisdiction, or sufficient claim-related contacts with California to provide the court with specific personal jurisdiction over defendants. *See LNS Enters. LLC v. Cont’l Motors, Inc.*, 22 F.4th 852, 858-59 (9th Cir. 2022) (discussing requirements for general and specific personal jurisdiction); *Pebble Beach Co. v. Caddy*, 453 F.3d 1151, 1158-59 (9th Cir. 2006) (discussing requirements for jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(k)(2)); *see also Holland Am. Line Inc. v. Wartsila N. Am., Inc.*, 485 F.3d 450, 460 (9th Cir. 2007) (“We consistently have held that a mere web presence is insufficient to establish personal jurisdiction.”).

Timothy B. Yoo and Christopher J. Lee’s motion to withdraw as counsel (Docket Entry No. 12) is granted.

Appellees’ request to strike portions of the supplemental excerpts of record, set forth in the answering brief, is denied as unnecessary. Appellees’ request for costs, set forth in the answering brief, is denied without prejudice to the filing of a separate, noticed motion. *See Fed. R. App. P. 38.*

AFFIRMED.