

NOV 30 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RICKY M. ARNTSEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STEVEN CLARK; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 08-35780

D.C. No. 2:07-cv-01967-JCC

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
John C. Coughenour, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 17, 2009**

Before: ALARCÓN, TROTT, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Ricky M. Arntsen appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment for defendants of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that he was falsely arrested.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *Arakaki v. Hawaii*, 314 F.3d 1091, 1094 (9th Cir. 2002), and we affirm.

Contrary to Arnsten's contentions, the record shows that the district court considered all of the facts submitted in opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment.

The district court did not err in granting summary judgment because the undisputed facts show that Officer Clark had probable cause to make both the October 5 and December 13, 2005 arrests, *see Cabrera v. City of Huntington Park*, 159 F.3d 374, 380 (9th Cir. 1998) (per curiam) (a finding of probable cause defeats a claim of false arrest), and that Detective Cooper properly relied on information obtained from Officer Clark in attesting to the facts in the Certification of Probable Cause, *see United States v. Jensen*, 425 F.3d 698, 704-05 (9th Cir. 2005) (collective knowledge of police officers sufficient to establish probable cause).

We do not to address the district court's dismissal of the state law claims or the claims against the City of Seattle because Arnsten did not develop arguments regarding these matters in his opening brief. *See Kim v. Kang*, 154 F.3d 996, 1000 (9th Cir. 1998) (concluding issues not specifically argued are deemed waived).

AFFIRMED.