

JAN 03 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

KENN GOLDBLATT, Pro Se and as
ADAAA Advocate for Barbara J. Baillie,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JAMES DOERTY, Individually and in his
Official Capacity as Assistant Presiding
Judge of the King County Superior Court,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 11-35720

D.C. No. 2:11-cv-00288-RSL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Robert S. Lasnik, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 19, 2012**

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

Kenn Goldblatt appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging federal and state law claims for violations of

* 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).

his due process and equal protection rights, and for failure to accommodate under the American with Disabilities Act (“ADA”). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *Miller v. Yokohama Tire Corp.*, 358 F.3d 616, 619 (9th Cir. 2004), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Goldblatt’s claims regarding defendant’s alleged denial of ADA accommodations because they arose out of defendant’s rulings in his capacity as a judge presiding over a state court family law proceeding, and, therefore, were barred by absolute judicial immunity. *See Duvall v. County of Kitsap*, 260 F.3d 1124, 1133 (9th Cir. 2001) (listing factors for determining whether an act is judicial in nature and explaining that a judge in marital dissolution proceedings was absolutely immune from claims related to orders denying a litigant ADA accommodations); *see also Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349, 356-58 (1978) (judges are immune from suit for actions within their jurisdiction even if proceedings are marred by grave errors or lack of due process).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Goldblatt’s motion for a new trial or to alter or amend the judgment because Goldblatt failed to establish grounds for such relief. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (setting forth standard of review and discussing factors for reconsideration or relief from judgment under

Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and 60(b)).

Goldblatt's contentions concerning the merits of his claims are rejected.

We do not address issues that are raised for the first time on appeal. *See Brown v. Gen. Tel. Co. of Cal.*, 108 F.3d 208, 210, n.1 (9th Cir. 1997).

Goldblatt's motion to supplement the record is granted.

AFFIRMED.