

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

AUG 1 2014

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

DAVID H. BLUNT,  
  
Plaintiff - Appellant,  
  
v.  
  
CITY OF SALEM, a Municipal  
Corporation,  
  
Defendant - Appellee.

No. 13-35005

D.C. No. 6:12-cv-00788-TC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Oregon  
Ann L. Aiken, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 22, 2014\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, CANBY, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

David H. Blunt appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. §1983 action alleging that defendant demolished his house in violation of federal law. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review

---

\* 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).

de novo and may affirm on any basis supported by the record. *Henrichs v. Valley View Dev.*, 474 F.3d 609, 613 n.1 (9th Cir. 2007). We affirm.

Dismissal of Blunt’s action was proper because it is barred by a prior state court decision under the doctrines of claim and issue preclusion. *See Dodd v. Hood River County*, 136 F.3d 1219, 1224-25 (9th Cir. 1998) (setting forth Oregon’s issue preclusion doctrine and explaining that “[f]ederal courts must give state court judgments the same preclusive effect as they would be given by courts of that state”); *Dodd v. Hood River County*, 59 F.3d 852, 861-62 (9th Cir. 1995) (setting forth Oregon’s claim preclusion doctrine).

**AFFIRMED.**