

DEC 14 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>VIKAS SAREEN,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>REEMA SAREEN; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 08-17395

D.C. No. 2:08-cv-00176-LKK-
EFB

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Lawrence K. Karlton, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 17, 2009**

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

Vikas Sareen, an attorney, appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional violations in

* 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).

connection with his child custody proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly concluded that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine barred Vikas Sareen’s action because it is a “forbidden de facto appeal” of a state court decision, and raises constitutional claims that are “inextricably intertwined” with that prior state court decision. *Id.* at 1158; *see also Bianchi v. Rylaarsdam*, 334 F.3d 895, 900 n.4 (9th Cir. 2003) (explaining that under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, “[i]t is immaterial that [the plaintiff] frames his federal complaint as a constitutional challenge to the state court[’s] decision[], rather than as a direct appeal of [that decision]”).

Appellant’s remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

AFFIRMED.