

OCT 13 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

In the Matter of: ARMANDO
RODRIGUEZ VENEGAS,
State Bar No. 100422,

No. 10-16297

D.C. No. 5:10-mc-80088-JW

ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ VENEGAS,

MEMORANDUM*

Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
James Ware, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 27, 2011**

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

Armando Rodriguez Venegas appeals pro se from the district court's order removing him from the roll of attorneys authorized to practice law before the Northern District of California based on his suspension by the California Supreme

* 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).

Court. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *In re Corrinet.*, 645 F.3d 1141, 1145 (9th Cir. 2011). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing reciprocal discipline on Venegas after reviewing his response to the court's order to show cause, including attached documents from the state disciplinary proceedings that led the California Supreme Court to suspend Venegas. *See Selling v. Radford*, 243 U.S. 46, 50-51 (1917) (federal court must review the relevant state court disciplinary record before imposing reciprocal discipline on attorney).

Venegas's remaining contentions, including his argument that the California Supreme Court's disciplinary adjudication should be declared void under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, are unpersuasive. *See Mothershed v. Justices of the Supreme Court*, 410 F.3d 602, 607-08 (9th Cir. 2005) (district court lacked jurisdiction to review merits of state disciplinary proceedings against attorney).

AFFIRMED.