

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 23 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RICHARD E. SHREVES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DEMETRIC GODFREY; CRYSTAL
THOMPSON; BRIAN GOOTKIN; JIM
SALMONSEN; CYNTHIA WOLKEN; JIM
ANDERSON; SCOTT MCNEIL; CHRIS
LAMB; AMANDA KAMBIC; TERRIE
STEFALO; KRISTY COBBAN; SALLE
ODEN; GREG BUDD; BRIAN
BUCKLER; ANTHONY
HOLLAND; JUSTIN
POMEROY; ANDREW
CORNELIUS; NICHOLAS
MOE; DAKOTA REESTED; CARRIE
WALSTED; DENNIS
JOHNSON; WENDY LARSEN,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-1692

D.C. No. 6:23-cv-00035-BMM-
KLD

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Montana
Brian M. Morris, District Judge, Presiding

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

Submitted January 22, 2026**

Before: WARDLAW, CLIFTON, and R. NELSON, Circuit Judges.

Richard Shreves appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging various federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)); *Pickern v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.), Inc.*, 457 F.3d 963, 968 (9th Cir. 2006) (compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Shreves’s action because, despite an opportunity to amend, Shreves’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”); *McHenry v. Renne*, 84 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 1996) (a complaint does not comply with Rule 8 if “one cannot determine from the complaint who is being sued, for what relief, and on what theory, with enough detail to guide discovery”).

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.

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