

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 20 2026

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

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOHN HENRY YABLONSKY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ALFORD, Teacher; CALIFORNIA  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND  
REHABILITATION; J. ROBLES, Teacher;  
BLAHNIK, Librarian; MARTINEZ;  
TICSCARNIA; McGUIRE; MONDET,  
Principal; STEADMAN, Associate Warden;  
S. ROBERTS, M.D.; HILL, Warden;  
BATES, VOC Supervisor; ANDERSON,  
Associate Warden; DOES 1-50;  
ARMENTA; PENELL,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-4915

D.C. No. 3:23-cv-02235-RSH-JLB

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of California  
Robert Steven Huie, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 16, 2026\*\*

---

\* 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).

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

California state prisoner John Henry Yablonsky appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional 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)); *Wilhelm v. Rotman*, 680 F.3d 1113, 1118 (9th Cir. 2012) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Yablonsky's First Amendment retaliation claims because Yablonsky failed to allege facts sufficient to state a plausible claim. *See Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (explaining that although pro se pleadings are construed liberally, a plaintiff must allege facts sufficient to state a plausible claim); *see also Watison*, 668 F.3d at 1114-15 (setting forth elements of a First Amendment retaliation claim in the prison context, including that the plaintiff must allege a causal connection between the adverse action and the protected conduct).

All pending motions and requests are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**