

MAY 29 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>HOLMGEIR BRYNJOLFSSON,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>STATE AGENCY LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,</p> <p>Defendant - Appellee.</p>
---

No. 12-55648

D.C. No. 2:11-cv-06775-CAS-  
FFM

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Christina A. Snyder, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 13, 2014\*\*

Before: CLIFTON, BEA, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Holmgeir Brynjolfsson appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against the Los Angeles Unified School District (“LAUSD”) alleging Fourteenth Amendment due process violations. We

---

\* 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).

have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal on the basis of Eleventh Amendment immunity, *Cholla Ready Mix, Inc. v. Civish*, 382 F.3d 969, 973 (9th Cir. 2004), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Brynjolffson’s action against LAUSD on the basis of Eleventh Amendment immunity. *See Belanger v. Madera Unified Sch. Dist.*, 963 F.2d 248, 251-54 (9th Cir. 1992) (a school district is a “state agency” for the purposes of the Eleventh Amendment); *see also Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984) (Eleventh Amendment immunity applies to states and their agencies or departments “regardless of the nature of the relief sought”).

**AFFIRMED.**