

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 22 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RAYMOND BALDWIN, Private Attorney
General, PAG; Class,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BARBIE DOE, (Last name unknown),
Clackamas County Deputy Clerk; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 17-35382

D.C. No. 3:16-cv-00109-PK

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
Michael W. Mosman, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 13, 2018**

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

Raymond Baldwin appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

* 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).

In his opening brief, Baldwin fails to address the district court's grounds for dismissal and has therefore waived his challenge to the district court's order. *See Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Washington*, 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[W]e will not consider any claims that were not actually argued in appellant’s opening brief.”); *Acosta-Huerta v. Estelle*, 7 F.3d 139, 144 (9th Cir. 1993) (issues not supported by argument in pro se appellant’s opening brief are waived); *see also Greenwood v. FAA*, 28 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 1994) (“We will not manufacture arguments for an appellant, and a bare assertion does not preserve a claim . . .”).

We reject as without merit Baldwin’s contention that the district court erred by failing to allow oral argument.

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

All pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.