

JUN 20 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>RAYMOND J. BAZELL,</p> <p>Petitioner - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,</p> <p>Respondent - Appellee.</p>
--

No. 11-56294

D.C. No. 2:11-cv-02097-GHK-OP

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
George H. King, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 18, 2013\*\*

Before: TALLMAN, M. SMITH, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Raymond J. Bazell appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging various constitutional violations in connection with his trial for a violation of section 21453 of the California Vehicle

---

\* 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).

Code. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). *Whitaker v. Garcetti*, 486 F.3d 572, 579 (9th Cir. 2007). We may affirm on any basis supported by the record. *Johnson v. Riverside Healthcare Sys., LP*, 534 F.3d 1116, 1121 (9th Cir. 2008). We affirm.

Dismissal of Bazell’s § 1983 action was proper because Bazell’s claims against the state of California are barred by the Eleventh Amendment. *See Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984) (“It is clear . . . that in the absence of consent a suit in which the State or one of its agencies or departments is named as the defendant is proscribed by the Eleventh Amendment.”).

Bazell’s request for judgment, filed on June 10, 2013, is denied as moot.

**AFFIRMED.**