

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

APR 2 2024

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

BRANDI SHAKIA SMITH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

GAIL CHASE, Chief Operating Officer;
NICOLE BOSCO, Human Resources
Director; LINDA WILEY, Executive
Director; KIMBERLY ROMERO, Human
Resources Director,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 23-15208

D.C. No. 2:22-cv-00459-GMS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
G. Murray Snow, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 26, 2024**

Before: TASHIMA, SILVERMAN, and KOH, Circuit Judges.

Brandi Shakia Smith appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing for lack of personal jurisdiction her action alleging employment discrimination and

* 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).

other claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Lazar v. Kroncke*, 862 F.3d 1186, 1193 (9th Cir. 2017). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Smith’s action for lack of personal jurisdiction because Smith did not allege facts sufficient to establish that defendants Chase and Bosco had sufficient contacts with Arizona to provide the court with either general or specific jurisdiction. *See Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown*, 564 U.S. 915, 924 (2011) (“For an individual, the paradigm forum for the exercise of general jurisdiction is the individual’s domicile”); *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d 797, 802 (9th Cir. 2004) (specific personal jurisdiction requires, among other things, that “the claim must . . . arise[] out of or relate[] to the defendant’s forum-related activities”).

Smith’s motion for injunctive relief (Docket Entry No. 6) is denied.

AFFIRMED.