

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 25 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

GREGORY SCOTT VAN HUISEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ERIC LAFRADES; ERIC CAFRADES,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-6485

D.C. No. 5:23-cv-04800-PCP

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
P. Casey Pitts, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2025\*\*

Before: GRABER, H.A. THOMAS, and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Gregory Scott Van Huisen appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging various claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. *Hayes v. Idaho Corr. Ctr.*, 849 F.3d 1204,

---

\* 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).

1208 (9th Cir. 2017). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Van Huisen's action because Van Huisen failed to allege facts sufficient to state any plausible claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (explaining that, 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)).

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).

**AFFIRMED.**