

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 28 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

KALEB LEE BASEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KYLE FREDERICK REARDON, in his
official capacity; JOLENE GOEDEN, in her
official capacity; UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA; FEDERAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION; DOJ - OFFICE OF
THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY;
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR UNITED
STATES ATTORNEYS; FEDERAL
BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION -
ANCHORAGE; DOJ - OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY -
DISTRICT OF ALASKA,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-1072

D.C. No.

3:23-cv-00124-SLG

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Alaska
Sharon L. Gleason, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 21, 2025**

* 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). Basey's request for oral
argument, set forth in the opening brief, is denied.

Before: SILVERMAN, LEE, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Federal prisoner Kaleb Lee Basey appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging federal claims relating to his criminal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Wilhelm v. Rotman*, 680 F.3d 1113, 1118 (9th Cir. 2012) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A); *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)). We may affirm on any basis supported by the record. *Thompson v. Paul*, 547 F.3d 1055, 1058-59 (9th Cir. 2008). We affirm.

Dismissal of Basey's due process claims was proper because Basey failed to allege facts sufficient to state a cognizable claim for relief. *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)); *Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001) (courts are not required to accept as true "allegations that are merely conclusory, unwarranted deductions of fact, or unreasonable inferences").

We reject as meritless Basey's contention that the district court should have vacated the denial of a certificate of appealability in Basey's prior criminal

proceeding.

AFFIRMED.