

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JAMES C. JOHNSON,
Plaintiff - Appellant,
v.
RENEE C. REYNA, Judge (San Mateo
County, Dept. 16); COUNTY OF SAN
MATEO,
Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-3971
D.C. No. 3:24-cv-01004-TLT

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Trina L. Thompson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 17, 2025**

Before: PAEZ, CHRISTEN, and KOH, Circuit Judges.

James C. Johnson appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional claims arising from a state court custody order. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We

* 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).

JAN 2 2026
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

review de novo. *Sato v. Orange County Dep’t of Educ.*, 861 F.3d 923, 928 (9th Cir. 2017) (Eleventh Amendment immunity); *Crooks v. Maynard*, 913 F.2d 699, 700 (9th Cir. 1990) (absolute immunity). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Johnson’s claims against Judge Renee C. Reyna as barred by absolute judicial immunity for judicial acts taken within the court’s jurisdiction. *See Schucker v. Rockwood*, 846 F.2d 1202, 1204 (9th Cir. 1988) (“Judges are absolutely immune from damage actions for judicial acts taken within the jurisdiction of their courts. . . . A judge loses absolute immunity only when [the judge] acts in the clear absence of all jurisdiction or performs an act that is not judicial in nature.”).

The district court properly dismissed Johnson’s claims against San Mateo County Superior Court as barred by Eleventh Amendment immunity. *See Munoz v. Superior Ct. of Los Angeles County*, 91 F.4th 977, 981 (9th Cir. 2024) (explaining that state courts are protected by Eleventh Amendment immunity).

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).

AFFIRMED.