

FILED**NOT FOR PUBLICATION****UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

APR 23 2021

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

RAUL MENDEZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

ADA COUNTY; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-35917

D.C. No. 1:19-cv-00301-BLW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Idaho
B. Lynn Winmill, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 20, 2021**

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

Raul Mendez appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging federal and state law claims arising out of a dispute regarding trash collection fees. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal for failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure

* 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).

MemberWorks, Inc., 625 F.3d 550, 557 (9th Cir. 2010) (elements of a RICO claim).

The district court did not err in denying Mendez's motions for injunctive relief without first holding hearings. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b)* ("By rule or order, the court may provide for submitting and determining motions on briefs, without oral hearings."); *D. Idaho L. Civ. R. 7.1(d)(1)(B)* ("If the presiding judge determines that oral argument will not be necessary, the matter will be decided on the briefs.").

The district court did not abuse its discretion in declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Mendez's state law claims and dismissing them without prejudice. *See 28 U.S.C. § 1337(c)(3); Parra v. PacifiCare of Ariz., Inc.*, 715 F.3d 1146, 1156 (9th Cir. 2013) (once a district court dismisses the only claims over which it had original jurisdiction, it does not abuse its discretion in dismissing the remaining state law claims).

To the extent that the district court erred in granting defendants' motion to strike materials submitted by Mendez in opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss, any error was harmless because, even considering those materials, Mendez's amended complaint failed to state a claim. *See Cooper v. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.*, 945 F.2d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1991) (if an error is harmless, it does not require reversal).

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

AUG 2 2021

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

RAUL MENDEZ,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

ADA COUNTY; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-35917

D.C. No. 1:19-cv-00301-BLW
District of Idaho,
Boise

ORDER

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

The full court has been advised of the petition for rehearing en banc and no judge has requested a vote on whether to rehear the matter en banc. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 35.

Mendez's petition for rehearing en banc (Docket Entry No. 19) is denied.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**