

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 25 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JESSE GRAHAM,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

TAYLOR SWIFT, an individual; KARL
MARTIN SANDBERG, an individual;
KARL JOHAN SCHUSTER, an individual;
SONY ATV MUSIC PUBLISHING, LLC, a
limited liability company; KOBALT MUSIC
PUBLISHING AMERICA, INC., a
Delaware Corporation; BIG MACHINE
LABEL GROUP LLC, a limited liability
company; UNIVERSAL MUSIC GROUP,
INC., a California Corporation; DOES, 1
through 10,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-55779

D.C. No. 2:19-cv-09948-AB-SS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Andre Birotte, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 15, 2022**

Before: FERNANDEZ, TASHIMA, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

* 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).

Jesse Graham appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his copyright action. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

In his opening brief, Graham failed to address the 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) (explaining that “we will not consider any claims that were not actually argued in appellant's opening brief”); *Smith v. Marsh*, 194 F.3d 1045, 1052 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that arguments raised for the first time in a reply brief are deemed waived); *see also Greenwood v. FAA*, 28 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 1994) (noting that “[w]e will not manufacture arguments for an appellant . . .”).

AFFIRMED.