

OCT 13 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>EUGENE E. ISAACSON,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>SHAWN BERRIGAN; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 10-15956

D.C. No. 2:09-cv-00017-MCE-DAD

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Morrison C. England, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 27, 2011\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, W. FLETCHER, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Eugene E. Isaacson appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his action alleging a conspiracy by defendants to have his vessel, the Gray Finn, seized and impounded. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, and may affirm on any basis supported by the record. *Corrie*

---

\* 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).

*v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, 503 F.3d 974, 979 (9th Cir. 2007). We affirm.

Dismissal of the action was proper because the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel bar Isaacson's claims given that he had previously litigated claims arising out of the seizure and impounding of his vessel in California state court. See *Manufactured Home Cmtys., Inc. v. City of San Jose*, 420 F.3d 1022, 1031 (9th Cir. 2005) (describing res judicata under California law); *Hydranautics v. FilmTec Corp.*, 204 F.3d 880, 885 (9th Cir. 2000) (describing collateral estoppel under California law).

Isaacson's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

**AFFIRMED.**