

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

RAYMOND T. DeMERITT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FRANK BISIGNANO, Commissioner of  
Social Security,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 25-4191

D.C. No. 8:25-cv-01239-KK-JC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Kenly Kiya Kato, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 16, 2026\*\*

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

Raymond T. DeMeritt appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for a preliminary injunction in his action challenging the garnishment of his Social Security benefit. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). 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).

review for an abuse of discretion. *Am. Trucking Ass'ns, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying DeMeritt's motion for a preliminary injunction because DeMeritt failed to establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits of his claims. *See Garcia v. Google, Inc.*, 786 F.3d 733, 740 (9th Cir. 2015) (en banc) (setting out preliminary injunction requirements and noting that "when a plaintiff has failed to show the likelihood of success on the merits, we need not consider the remaining three [*Winter* elements]" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)); *see also United States v. Morton*, 467 U.S. 822, 829 (1984) (concluding that executing a garnishment order does not require examination beyond the face of the legal process).

The request (Docket Entry No. 19) for judicial notice is granted.

**AFFIRMED.**