

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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.

Honorable MARY H. MURGUIA, Chief
Circuit Judge, Hon. Judge; UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
NINTH CIRCUIT, (Administrative),

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-3183

D.C. No. 3:25-cv-01364-WHO

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
William Horsley Orrick, 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

* 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 Judge Murguia is entitled to absolute judicial immunity, and because Murray otherwise 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)); *Schucker v. Rockwood*, 846 F.2d 1202, 1204 (9th Cir. 1988) (explaining judicial immunity doctrine).

The district court properly denied as moot Murray’s motions for disability accommodations and for a preliminary injunction because the action had already been dismissed. *See Rocky Mountain Farmers Union v. Corey*, 913 F.3d 940, 949 (9th Cir. 2019) (standard of review).

We reject as unsupported by the record Murray’s contentions that the district court retaliated against her, ignored any of her filings, or denied her due process or access to the courts, or that defendants were conflicted.

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.