

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 9 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JUSTIN BECK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CATANZARITE LAW CORPORATION;
STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA; RUBEN
DURAN; SUZANNE GRANDT;
RICHARD FRANCIS O'CONNOR, Jr.;
JAMES DUFFY, AKA Jim Duffy;
KENNETH J. CATANZARITE; JIM
TRAVIS TICE, Attorney; NICOLE MARIE
CATANZARITE WOODWARD;
BRANDON WOODWARD; TIM JAMES
O'KEEFE; AMY JEANETTE COOPER;
CLIFF HIGGERSON; ELI DAVID
MORGENSTERN; LEAH WILSON;
ANTHONY B. SCUDDER; ELLIN
DAVTYAN, General Counsel; ROBERT
GEORGE RETANA; GEORGE S.
CARDONA; JORGE NAVARETTE;
JOHN C. GASTELUM; ORANGE
COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT; UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA; STATE OF
CALIFORNIA; ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES; ORANGE
COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S
OFFICE; MOHAMMED ZAKHIREH,

No. 24-1727

D.C. No. 3:22-cv-01616-AGS-DDL

MEMORANDUM*

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

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Andrew George Schopler, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 19, 2025**

Before: SILVERMAN, HURWITZ, and BADE, Circuit Judges.

Justin Beck appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 his action alleging federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Pickern v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.), Inc.*, 457 F.3d 963, 968 (9th Cir. 2006).

We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Beck's action because, despite an opportunity to amend, Beck's operative complaint failed to comply with Rule 8. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) (a pleading must contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief"); *Nevijel v. N. Coast Life Ins. Co.*, 651 F.2d 671, 674 (9th Cir. 1981) (a complaint that is "verbose, confusing and conclusory" violates Rule 8).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying further leave to

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

amend because amendment would have been futile. *See Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 656 F.3d 1034, 1041 (9th Cir. 2011) (setting forth standard of review and explaining that leave to amend may be denied when amendment would be futile); *Metzler Inv. GMBH v. Corinthian Colls., Inc.*, 540 F.3d 1049, 1072 (9th Cir. 2008) (explaining that “the district court’s discretion to deny leave to amend is particularly broad where plaintiff has previously amended the complaint” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

We reject as unsupported by the record Beck’s contention that the district court was biased against him.

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.