

MAY 22 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>SAMUEL O. GONZALEZ,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>

No. 12-35654

D.C. No. 3:12-cv-05242-RBL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Ronald B. Leighton, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 14, 2013**

Before: LEAVY, THOMAS, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Washington state prisoner Samuel O. Gonzalez appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that state court judges violated his right to the free exercise of religion by refusing to transfer

* 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 pending felony charges to an ecclesiastical tribunal. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Maldonado v. Harris*, 370 F.3d 945, 949 (9th Cir. 2004). We may affirm on any ground supported by the record. *Id.* We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Gonzalez’s claim against the Washington Supreme Court because that claim is barred by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *See Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1164 (9th Cir. 2003) (“If a federal plaintiff asserts as a legal wrong an allegedly erroneous decision by a state court, and seeks relief from a state court judgment based on that decision, *Rooker-Feldman* bars subject matter jurisdiction in federal district court.”).

Dismissal of Gonzalez’s claims against the remaining defendants was proper because those claims also are barred by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *See id.* at 1158 (where *Rooker-Feldman* applies, a federal court “must also refuse to decide any issue raised in the suit that is ‘inextricably intertwined’ with an issue resolved by the state court in its judicial decision”).

AFFIRMED.