

NOV 22 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ROLAND COOKE,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>BRUCE R. WISAN; WISAN SMITH RACKER & PRESCOTT,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>

No. 10-16125

D.C. No. 3:09-cv-08152-JAT

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
James A. Teilborg, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 21, 2011 **

Before: TASHIMA, BERZON, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges.

Roland Cooke appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing for lack of standing his action alleging that the defendants “confiscated the homes and property of 20,000 - 70,000 people in Utah, Arizona and Canada.” We have

* 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).

jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *Wilson v. Kayo Oil Co.*, 563 F.3d 979, 980 (9th Cir. 2009) (per curiam), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed the action for lack of standing because Cooke failed to allege any particularized injury to him that was fairly traceable to the defendants. *See Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992) (standing under Article III requires a plaintiff to show that he suffered an invasion of a legally protected interest which is concrete, particularized, and fairly traceable to the challenged action of the defendant).

AFFIRMED.