

JUN 09 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>RICHARD J. GLAIR,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>CITY OF LOS ANGELES; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>
---

No. 10-55843

D.C. No. 2:09-cv-06450-R-RNB

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Manuel L. Real, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 24, 2011\*\*

Before: PREGERSON, THOMAS, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Richard J. Glair appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985(2) action alleging civil rights violations. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Nelson v. Heiss*, 271 F.3d 891, 893 (9th Cir. 2001). We affirm.

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

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

The district court properly dismissed this action because, viewing the allegations as true and in the light most favorable to Glair, the allegations in the complaint and the proposed first amended complaint were insufficient to state a claim for relief. *See Mendocino Env'tl. Ctr. v. Mendocino Cnty.*, 192 F.3d 1283, 1300-01 (9th Cir. 1999) (elements of a First Amendment claim); *Dooley v. Reiss*, 736 F.2d 1392, 1395-96 (9th Cir. 1984) (allegations that defendants conspired to commit perjury and to conceal evidence failed to state a claim for relief under section 1985(2) because alleged actions did not influence or seek to influence a juror by force, intimidation, or threat); *Ivey v. Bd. of Regents*, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982) (“Vague and conclusory allegations of official participation in civil rights violations are not sufficient to withstand a motion to dismiss.”).

**AFFIRMED.**