

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 23 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

DAVID Q. WEBB,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 22-36008

D.C. No. 3:22-cv-05448-TL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Tana Lin, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 16, 2023**

Before: GRABER, MILLER, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

David Q. Webb 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. *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012) (dismissal for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e));

* 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).

Pickern v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.), Inc., 457 F.3d 963, 968 (9th Cir. 2006)

(compliance with notice pleading requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Webb’s action because Webb failed to allege facts sufficient to state a plausible claim and 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 a pleader is entitled to relief”); *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); *see also Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009) (complaint must contain more than bare assertions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a claim).

AFFIRMED.