

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 24 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

HOWARD HERSHIPS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

YOLO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 24-6811

D.C. No. 2:24-cv-00677-DAD-CKD

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted April 22, 2026\*\*

Before: LEE, DESAI, and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

Howard Hershhips appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action arising out of state court proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012). 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)*.

affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Herships's action because his claims are barred by Eleventh Amendment immunity. *See Munoz v. Superior Ct. of Los Angeles County*, 91 F.4th 977, 980 (9th Cir. 2024) (explaining that California Superior Courts are protected by Eleventh Amendment immunity).

All pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**