

## **APPENDIX**

**APPENDIX****TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Appendix A	Opinion in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (May 23, 2023). . . . .	App. 1
Appendix B	Order in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California (January 28, 2021) . . . . .	App. 6
Appendix C	Order in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California (November 20, 2020). . . . .	App. 8
Appendix D	Docket Order in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California (July 15, 2021). . . . .	App. 10
Appendix E	Order Denying Petition for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (September 8, 2023) . . . . .	App. 11

App. 1

---

**APPENDIX A**

---

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**No. 21-15344  
D.C. No. 3:13-cv-04280-VC**

**[Filed May 23, 2023]**

---

INDIEZONE, INC.,	)
	)
Plaintiff-Appellant,	)
	)
CONOR FENNELLY; DOUGLAS	)
RICHARD DOLLINGER,	)
	)
Appellants,	)
	)
and	)
	)
EOBUY, LIMITED,	)
	)
Plaintiff,	)
	)
v.	)
	)

App. 2

JOE ROGNESS; TODD ROOKE, )  
)  
Defendants-Appellees, )  
)  
and )  
)  
PHIL HAZEL; et al., )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

No. 21-16338

D.C. No. 3:13-cv-04280-VC

\_\_\_\_\_ )  
INDIEZONE, INC., )  
)  
Plaintiff-Appellant, )  
)  
CONOR FENNELLY; DOUGLAS )  
RICHARD DOLLINGER, )  
)  
Appellants, )  
)  
and )  
)  
EOBUY, LIMITED, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)

JOE ROGNESS; et al., )  
 )  
 Defendants-Appellees. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Vince Chhabria, District Judge, Presiding

Before: GRABER, MILLER, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Appellants Indiezone, Inc., Conor Fennelly and Douglas Richard Dollinger appeal from the district court’s post-judgment orders denying their motions for an extension of time to file a notice of appeal and to reopen their case. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Henson v. Fid. Nat’l Fin., Inc.*, 943 F.3d 434, 443 (9th Cir. 2019) (denial of a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)); *Pincay v. Andrews*, 389 F.3d 853, 858 (9th Cir. 2004) (en banc) (denial of an extension of time to file a notice of appeal). We affirm.

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

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

#### App. 4

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying appellants' motion for an extension of time to file a notice of appeal because appellants failed to demonstrate good cause or excusable neglect. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5)(A) (the district court may extend time for filing notice of appeal upon showing of good cause or excusable neglect); *Pincaj*, 389 F.3d at 858-60 (discussing excusable neglect and explaining that this court must affirm unless there is a definite and firm conviction that the district court committed a clear error of judgment).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying appellants' motion under Rule 60(b)(6) because appellants failed to demonstrate a change in the controlling law that would justify reopening the final judgment. *See Henson*, 943 F.3d at 443-44 (9th Cir. 2019) ("A movant seeking relief under Rule 60(b)(6) must show extraordinary circumstance justifying the reopening of a final judgment[.]" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

We lack jurisdiction to consider appellants' contentions regarding the district court's November 23, 2020 order denying appellants' motions to recuse and for relief from judgment. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A) (in civil cases a notice of appeal must be filed within thirty days after entry of the judgment); *United States v. Vaccaro*, 51 F.3d 189, 191 (9th Cir. 1995) (the timely filing of a notice of appeal is a jurisdictional requirement).

We reject as unsupported by the record appellants' contentions that they were denied due process by the

App. 5

district court and that the district court was biased against them.

**AFFIRMED.**

---

**APPENDIX B**

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**Case No. 13-cv-04280-VC**

**[Filed January 28, 2021]**

---

INDIEZONE, INC., et al.,	)
	)
Plaintiffs,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
TODD ROOKE, et al.,	)
	)
Defendants.	)

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
LEAVE TO FILE LATE APPEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 207

The motion is denied for failure to show good cause. It was counsel's fault that they had not ensured that they possessed the ability to electronically file a notice of appeal at the eleventh hour, and their neglect was not excusable, particularly given the litany of other miscues and rule



App. 7

violations committed by counsel throughout the course of this case. *See Hoy v. Yamhill*, 693 Fed. Appx. 664 (2017).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: January 28, 2021

---

VINCE CHHABRIA  
United States District Judge

---

**APPENDIX C**

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**Case No. 13-cv-04280-VC**

**[Filed November 23, 2020]**

---

INDIEZONE, INC., et al.,	)
	)
Plaintiffs,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
TODD ROOKE, et al.,	)
	)
Defendants.	)

---

**ORDER**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 198, 199

The motion for recusal (Dkt. No. 198) is denied. The motion for relief from the judgment (Dkt. No. 199) is also denied.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

App. 9

Dated: November 23, 2020

---

VINCE CHHABRIA  
United States District Judge

App. 10

---

**APPENDIX D**

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**Case No. 13-cv-04280-VC**

**[Filed July 15, 2021]**

---

INDIEZONE, INC., et al.,	)
	)
Plaintiffs,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
TODD ROOKE, et al.,	)
	)
Defendants.	)

---

**DOCKET ORDER ONLY**

07/15/2021 222 Order by Judge Vince Chhabria denying 221 Motion to Reopen Case. The motion is denied in its entirety. (This is a text-only entry generated by the court. There is no document associated with this entry.) (vclclS, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 7/15/2021) (Entered: 07/15/2021)

App. 11

---

**APPENDIX E**

---

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**No. 21-15344**

**D.C. No. 3:13-cv-04280-VC**

**Northern District of California, San Francisco**

**[Filed September 8, 2023]**

---

INDIEZONE, INC.,	)
	)
Plaintiff-Appellant,	)
	)
CONOR FENNELLY; DOUGLAS	)
RICHARD DOLLINGER,	)
	)
Appellants,	)
	)
and	)
	)
EOBUY, LIMITED,	)
	)
Plaintiff,	)
	)
v.	)
	)

App. 12

JOE ROGNESS; TODD ROOKE, )  
)  
Defendants-Appellees, )  
)  
and )  
)  
PHIL HAZEL; et al., )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

No. 21-16338

D.C. No. 3:13-cv-04280-VC

Northern District of California, San Francisco

\_\_\_\_\_ )  
INDIEZONE, INC., )  
)  
Plaintiff-Appellant, )  
)  
CONOR FENNELLY; DOUGLAS )  
RICHARD DOLLINGER, )  
)  
Appellants, )  
)  
and )  
)  
EOBUY, LIMITED, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)

JOE ROGNESS; et al., )  
 )  
 Defendants-Appellees. )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Before: GRABER, MILLER, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

The panel has voted to deny the petition for panel rehearing.

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.

Dollinger's petition for panel rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc (Docket Entry No. 45 in Appeal No. 21-15344; Docket Entry No. 33 in Appeal No. 21-16338) are denied.