

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 20 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

OLIVIA ARMOUR; CHANEL E.
ARMOUR,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

FIDELITY SELECT TECHNOLOGY
PORTFOLIO; FIDELITY CONVERTIBLE
SECURITIES FUND; FIDELITY NEW
MILLENIUM FUND; FIDELITY
GROWTH & INCOME FUND; FIDELITY
GOVERNMENT INCOME
FUND; FIDELITY PURITAN
FUND; FIDELITY GNMA; FIDELITY
SELECT TECH HARDWARE
PORTFOLIO; FIDELITY TREND
FUND; FIDELITY INVESTMENT
MONEY MARKET TAX EXEMPT
PORTFOLIO CLASS I; FIDELITY
SELECT ENERGY
PORTFOLIO; FIDELITY EQUITY
INCOME FUND; FIDELITY GROWTH
COMPANY FUND; FIDELITY SELECT
SEMICONDUCTOR
PORTFOLIO; FIDELITY SELECT
CONSUMER STAPLES
PORTFOLIO; FIDELITY ADVISOR
GLOBAL CAPITAL APPRECIATION

No. 24-2726

D.C. No. 3:23-cv-02074-JES-VET

MEMORANDUM*

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

FUND CLASS I; FIDELITY SELECT
CHEMICALS PORTFOLIO; FIDELITY
ADVISOR INCOME FUND-CLASS I,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
James E. Simmons, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 15, 2025**

Before: FRIEDLAND, MILLER, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

Olivia Armour appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her action alleging federal and state law claims related to a variety of Fidelity accounts. 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 Armour's action because Armour 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)).

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

We reject as unsupported by the record Armour's allegations of judicial bias and her contentions concerning the summons.

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 or requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.