

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 19 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JAMES O. MOLEN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES 9TH DISTRICT
COURT, Eastern District of California; et
al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 18-16291

D.C. No. 2:17-cv-02224-JAM-
CMK

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 12, 2021**

Before: TALLMAN, RAWLINSON, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

James O. Molen appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C.

* 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).

§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Molen's action because defendants are protected by judicial immunity. *See Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11-12 (1991) (discussing judicial immunity and its limited exceptions); *Mullis v. U.S. Bankr. Court*, 828 F.2d 1385, 1390 (9th Cir. 1987) (holding that court clerks have absolute quasi-judicial immunity for performing, or failing to perform, tasks integral to the judicial process).

We reject as unsupported by the record Molen's contentions that the magistrate and district judges engaged in misconduct.

Molen's motions and requests, set forth in the opening brief, are denied.

AFFIRMED.