

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JAN 27 2026

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

ERNESTO ALVARADO,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF'S
DEPARTMENT; CHAD
BIANCO; RIVERSIDE COUNTY BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS; CITY OF SAN
JACINTO; RIVERSIDE COUNTY FIRE
DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-928

D.C. No. 5:24-cv-01579-FMO-AS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Fernando M. Olguin, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 22, 2026**

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

Ernesto Alvarado appeals pro se from the district court's judgment

* 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).

dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendment violations. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Alvarado's action because Alvarado failed to allege facts sufficient to state any plausible claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (explaining that, 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 district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing without further leave to 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 dismissal without leave to amend is proper when amendment would be futile).

AFFIRMED.