

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 23 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ROBERT ALLEN RICHARDS, Jr.,

No. 17-56732

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:17-cv-00400-PSG-AGR

v.

MEMORANDUM*

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Philip S. Gutierrez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 15, 2018**

Before: SILVERMAN, BEA, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Robert Allen Richards, Jr., appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act and other claims in connection with child support proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal

* 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).

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

The district court properly dismissed Richards’s action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because Richards’s claims constituted a forbidden “de facto appeal” of a prior state court judgment or were “inextricably intertwined” with that judgment. *See id.* at 1163-65 (discussing proper application of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine); *see also Henrichs v. Valley View Dev.*, 474 F.3d 609, 616 (9th Cir. 2007) (*Rooker-Feldman* doctrine barred plaintiff’s claim because the relief sought “would require the district court to determine that the state court’s decision was wrong and thus void”).

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief, or 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 do not consider documents or facts not presented to the district court. *See United States v. Elias*, 921 F.2d 870, 874 (9th Cir. 1990) (“Documents or facts not presented to the district court are not part of the record on appeal.”).

Richards’s motion for leave to file multiple reply briefs (Docket Entry No. 24) is granted. The Clerk shall file the reply briefs submitted at Docket Entry Nos. 20 to 23.

AFFIRMED.