

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 19 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MELVIN J. HOWARD,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

MAXIMUS, INC., DBA Maxiums, Canada  
Inc., DBA Themis Program Management &  
Consulting Ltd.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 14-35693

D.C. No. 3:13-cv-01111-ST

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Oregon  
Anna J. Brown, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 13, 2016\*\*

Before: HAWKINS, N.R. SMITH, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Melvin J. Howard appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging violations of international human rights, the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, and corporate law arising out

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

of defendants' alleged injuries to Howard and his business endeavors. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo the district court's dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). *Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341 (9th Cir. 2010). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Howard's action because Howard failed to allege facts sufficient to state any plausible claim for relief. *See id.* at 341-42 (though pro se pleadings are to be liberally construed, a plaintiff must still present factual allegations sufficient to state a plausible claim for relief); *Johnson v. Riverside Healthcare Sys., LP*, 534 F.3d 1116, 1121-22 (9th Cir. 2008) ("A Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal may be based on either a lack of a cognizable legal theory or the absence of sufficient facts alleged under a cognizable legal theory." (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)).

We do not consider arguments and allegations raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

We reject as unsupported by the record Howard's contention that the district court failed to consider any of the record or the claims he raised.

**AFFIRMED.**