

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 20 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

KAREN MARIE ISAACSON,

No. 20-35442

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:20-cv-00588-RAJ

v.

MEMORANDUM*

MARCIA L. FUDGE, Secretary, United
States Department of Housing and Urban
Development; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Richard A. Jones, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 14, 2021**

Before: WALLACE, CLIFTON, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Karen Marie Isaacson appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing for lack of standing her action alleging claims related to a Department of Housing and Urban Development rule. We have jurisdiction 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).

§ 1291. We review de novo. *Gingery v. City of Glendale*, 831 F.3d 1222, 1226 (9th Cir. 2016) (dismissal for lack of standing); *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order) (dismissal as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Isaacson’s action because Isaacson failed to allege facts sufficient to establish Article III standing. *See Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992) (constitutional standing requires an “injury in fact,” causation, and redressability, and “the injury has to be fairly . . . trace[able] to the challenged action of the defendant” as opposed to “the independent action of some third party not before the court” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Appellees’ motion for summary affirmance (Docket Entry No. 17) is denied.

AFFIRMED.