

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 21 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

LEANNE J. HENSLEY,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Defendant-Appellee.

No. 21-35976

D.C. No. 3:20-cv-00859-JR

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
Michael W. Mosman, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 17, 2023**

Before: CLIFTON, R. NELSON, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

Leanne J. Hensley appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 her action alleging federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.

§ 1291. We review de novo. *Pickern v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.), Inc.*, 457 F.3d 963,

* 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).

968 (9th Cir. 2006). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Hensley's action because after repeated amendment, Hensley's operative amended complaint failed to comply with Rule 8. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) (a pleading must contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief"); *McHenry v. Renne*, 84 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 1996) (a complaint does not comply with Rule 8 if "one cannot determine from the complaint who is being sued, for what relief, and on what theory"); *Nevijel v. N. Coast Life Ins. Co.*, 651 F.2d 671, 674 (9th Cir. 1981) (a complaint that is "verbose, confusing and conclusory" violates Rule 8).

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).

Hensley's motions to refer this appeal to mediation (Docket Entry No. 10) and seeking appointment of a special master (Docket Entry No. 25) are denied.

AFFIRMED.