

NOV 23 2016

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

WYLMINA ELIZABETH HETTINGA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

TIMOTHY P. LOUMENA; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 14-17135

D.C. No. 5:13-cv-02217-RMW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Ronald M. Whyte, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 16, 2016**

Before: LEAVY, BERZON, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Wylmina Elizabeth Hettinga appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional violations arising from her state court divorce proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28

* 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). Accordingly, Hettinga's requests for oral argument set forth in her opening brief and reply are denied.

U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

We affirm the district court’s dismissal because Hettinga failed to raise any argument in her opening brief concerning the district court’s ground for dismissal, and has therefore waived her appeal of the district court’s judgment. *See Smith v. Marsh*, 194 F.3d 1045, 1052 (9th Cir. 1999) (“[A]rguments not raised by a party in its opening brief are deemed waived.”).

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

AFFIRMED.