## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**FILED** 

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 21 2025

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

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ANDREA MORROW,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GENIUS FUND; LIAM PALMIERI; CHRIS FINELLI; ARI STIEGLER; FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION; LINKEDIN CORPORATION; USA TODAY; TAMI ABDOLLAH; JOHN DOES, 1-10 Inclusive,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-2306

D.C. No. 3:24-cv-00039-SB

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Oregon Michael H. Simon, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 17, 2025\*\*

Before: CANBY, R. NELSON, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2). Morrow's request for oral argument, set forth in the opening brief, is denied.

Andrea Morrow appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her action alleging federal and state law claims relating to stalking, hacking, and withholding of information. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Morrow's action because Morrow failed to allege facts sufficient to state any plausible claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (to avoid dismissal, "a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)); *see also* 18 U.S.C. §§ 1030(a)(2), (a)(5) (setting forth requirements to bring a claim under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act); *Morasch v. Hood*, 222 P.3d 1125, 1131-32 (Or. Ct. App. 2009) (setting forth elements of a civil conspiracy claim).

We do not consider arguments and allegations raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

Morrow's motion to substitute her opening brief (Docket Entry No. 13) is granted. All other pending motions and requests are denied.

## AFFIRMED.

2 24-2306