

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 22 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JEFFREY GRAY THOMAS,

No. 17-55404

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:16-cv-06544-JAK-AJW

v.

MEMORANDUM*

LAURIE ZELON; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

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

Submitted March 13, 2018**

Before: LEAVY, M. SMITH, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

California attorney Jeffrey Gray Thomas appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging federal claims related to sanctions entered against Thomas in a state court action. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under the *Rooker-Feldman*

* 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). Thomas's request for oral argument, set forth in his opening brief, is denied.

doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Thomas’s action as barred by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because Thomas’s claims stemming from the prior state court action constitute a “de facto appeal” of prior state court judgments, or are “inextricably intertwined” with those judgments. *See id.* at 1155-57 (the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine bars de facto appeals of a state court decision); *see also Cooper v. Ramos*, 704 F.3d 772, 781-83 (9th Cir. 2012) (*Rooker-Feldman* doctrine bars claims where “federal relief can only be predicated upon a conviction that the state court was wrong” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

All pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.