

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 20 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

EARON DREVN DAVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL A. JACQUES; LAURA VAN
BUSKRIK; TAMARA UHLER; PLACER
COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF CHILD
SUPPORT SERVICES,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-7407

D.C. No. 2:23-cv-01230-DAD-JDP

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Dale A. Drozd, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 16, 2026**

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

Earon Drevon Davis appeals pro se from the district court's judgment
dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging claims arising from a state court

* 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).

child support order. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003) (dismissal under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine); *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Davis’s action because Davis’s claims were a “de facto appeal” of a prior state court judgment or were “inextricably intertwined” with the judgment. *See Miroth v. County of Trinity*, 136 F.4th 1141, 1155 (9th Cir. 2025) (explaining that a request for a federal court to address the “consequences” of a state court judgment by vacating or reversing the state court’s orders implicates *Rooker-Feldman*); *Noel*, 341 F.3d at 1163 (“It is a forbidden de facto appeal under *Rooker-Feldman* when the plaintiff in federal district court complains of a legal wrong allegedly committed by the state court, and seeks relief from the judgment of that court.”); *see also Cooper v. Ramos*, 704 F.3d 772, 782 (9th Cir. 2012) (explaining that claims are “inextricably intertwined” with state court decisions where federal adjudication “would impermissibly undercut the state ruling on the same issues” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in declining to enter default judgment against defendants. *See Eitel v. McCool*, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471-72 (9th Cir. 1986) (setting forth standard of review and factors courts may consider in determining whether to enter default judgment).

All pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.