

1 Frederick Luehring
550 W. Rancho Vista BLVD.,Ste. D.
2 Palmdale,CA.,93551
Sundancetrust55@proton.me

3 Frederick Luehring,Self-Represented

7 UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

9 FREDERICK LUEHRING

10 Petitioner/Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 LOS ANGELES COUNTY et. al.

13 Respondent/Defendant(s)

) Case No.: 2:21-cv-01426-GW-SHK

) MOTION FOR A 60 DAY EXTENSION OF
) TIME TO FILE WRIT OF CERTIORARI
) (RULE 30.4)

15 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD,Plaintiff/petitioner,Frederick Luehring,
16 Respectfully request a 60 day extension in which to file a writ of certiorari.

17 Petitioner requests this extension in order to do legal research,petitioner does not have ready access to
18 the internet or computers. *And is currently out of state, Dealing*
19 *with a death in the family. FL*

24 Dated;01/21/2025

24 Respectfully submitted by;Frederick Luehring.



26 RECEIVED

27 JAN 30 2025

28 OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

FILED

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 23 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

FREDERICK LUEHRING,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES; DETAIL
2601; LOS ANGELES OFFICE OF THE
DISTRICT ATTORNEY; DOES; LOS
ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S
DEPARTMENT; LOHNNIE DAY; ADAM
STROLL; TIM HOUSER; BRIAN
BANKS,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 23-1521

D.C. No. 2:21-cv-01426-GW-SHK

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
George H. Wu, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 17, 2024**

Before: WALLACE, GRABER, and BUMATAY, 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).

Frederick Luehring appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action arising out of an arrest. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion a dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). *Applied Underwriters, Inc. v. Lichtenegger*, 913 F.3d 884, 890 (9th Cir. 2019). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing Luehring's action because Luehring failed to comply with court orders to serve the complaint and to show cause regarding service, despite the district court's warning that failure to serve the complaint or file some other document showing diligent prosecution would result in dismissal. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) (district court may dismiss an action "[i]f the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order"); *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 640-43 (9th Cir. 2002) (discussing factors to be considered before dismissing a case for failure to comply with a court order; a district court's dismissal should not be disturbed absent "a definite and firm conviction" that it "committed a clear error of judgment" (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)).

We reject as unsupported by the record Luehring's contention that the district court disregarded a response to the order to show cause.

Luehring's requests for judicial notice, set forth in the opening brief, are

denied.

AFFIRMED.