

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 18 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ANTHONY McGEE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY OFFICE OF  
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY; LINDSEY  
WALSH; MILPITAS POLICE  
DEPARTMENT; SANTA CLARA  
COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE; PALO  
ALTO POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-5356

D.C. No. 3:24-cv-02608-CRB

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Charles R. Breyer, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 16, 2026\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, NGUYEN, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Anthony McGee 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 Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment violations arising from his arrest, detention, and prosecution. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

Because McGee does not challenge in his opening brief the district court's grounds for dismissal of his action, we do not consider that decision. *See Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Washington*, 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003) (explaining that “we will not consider any claims that were not actually argued in appellant’s opening brief”); *Acosta-Huerta v. Estelle*, 7 F.3d 139, 144 (9th Cir. 1993) (explaining that issues not supported by argument in pro se appellant’s opening brief are deemed abandoned).

We reject as unsupported by the record McGee’s contention that he requested a stay of proceedings.

All pending motions and requests are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**