

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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.