

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 14 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

BARBARA A. STUART ROBINSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF SEATTLE,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 24-4357

D.C. No. 2:24-cv-01004-RSL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Robert S. Lasnik, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 12, 2025**

Before: SCHROEDER, RAWLINSON, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Barbara A. Stuart Robinson appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her action concerning the Seattle police department's failure to respond to her call. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Lake v. Ohana Mil. Cmtys., LLC*, 14 F.4th 993, 1000 (9th Cir. 2021) (dismissal for lack

* 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).

of subject matter jurisdiction); *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Stuart Robinson’s action because Stuart Robinson failed to satisfy her burden of establishing subject matter jurisdiction. *See Ashoff v. City of Ukiah*, 130 F.3d 409, 410 (9th Cir. 1997) (stating that the plaintiff has the burden of establishing subject matter jurisdiction); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (setting forth basis for federal question jurisdiction).

Because Stuart Robinson did not sufficiently raise in the district court her contentions concerning screening or an interlocutory injunction, we do not consider them. *See Friedman v. AARP, Inc.*, 855 F.3d 1047, 1057 (9th Cir. 2017) (“Our general rule is that we do not consider an issue not passed upon below.”); *Bracken v. Okura*, 869 F.3d 771, 776 n.3 (9th Cir. 2017) (“To have been properly raised below, [an] argument must be raised sufficiently for the trial court to rule on it.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Stuart Robinson’s motion (Docket Entry No. 6) to file a supplemental opening brief is granted. The clerk will file Stuart Robinson’s brief submitted at Docket Entry No. 5.

AFFIRMED.