

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 25 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

SARA MURRAY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DOJ - OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEY - WESTERN DISTRICT OF  
WASHINGTON; TESSA GORMAN,  
United States Attorney; SUSAN KAS,  
United States Attorney,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-2378

D.C. No. 2:25-cv-00259-LK

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Washington  
Lauren J. King, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 15, 2025\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Sara Murray appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her  
action brought under the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") and the

---

\* 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).

Rehabilitation Act. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

*Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Murray’s action because Murray 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* 42 U.S.C. § 12131(1) (setting forth entities covered under the ADA); 29 U.S.C. §§ 705(20), 794(a) (setting forth what one needs to show to be considered a “qualified individual with a disability” under the Rehabilitation Act); *Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973) (A “private citizen lacks a judicially cognizable interest in the prosecution or nonprosecution of another.”).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Murray’s motions to recuse because Murray failed to establish any grounds for such relief. *See United States v. Johnson*, 610 F.3d 1138, 1147 (9th Cir. 2010) (setting forth standard of review and grounds for recusal).

Murray did not establish any error concerning the district court’s denial of

her request for disability accommodations.

We reject as unsupported by the record Murray's contention that the district court made defamatory statements about her or failed to rule on any of her motions.

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).

All pending motions and requests are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**