

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

ARTHUR TSATRYAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STEVEN PAUL FERNANDEZ; STEVEN SHORE; CRAIG NADAI; JEAN YOUNG KIM; MARK KARNEY; S. DAVID KOZICH; MAYA SHULMAN; HONEY BEE GONZALEZ TOTTEN; KITAMU HARDIE; MARK JUHAS; DEAN HANSELL; DAVID W. SWIFT; LAURIE DEE ZELON; DENNIS MAYER PERLUSS; JOHN L. SEGAL; GAIL RUDERMAN FEUER; HELEN ZUKIN; AUDREY B. COLLINS; AUDRA M. MORI; DENNIS P. BLOCK; DIANA JUMATAER; HYKUI MOVSISYAN; DENNIS P. BLOCK & ASSOCIATES, APC, CA Professional Stock Corporation; FERNANDEZ & KARNEY, APC, CA Professional Stock Corporation; LINDA T. BARNEY; Ms. ANITA SUSAN BRENNER Esquire; ROBERT DRAPER; JILL FEENEY; PATRICIA YOUNG; DIANNA GOULD SALTMAN; CRYSTAL MICHELE BOULTINGHOUSE; JOHN MICHAEL KELLY; GONZALO C.

No. 24-6898

D.C. No. 2:24-cv-08947-CBM-JPR

MEMORANDUM\*

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

MARTINEZ; POLINA TSATRYAN;  
DOES, 1 through 10, Inclusive,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Consuelo B. Marshall, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2026\*\*

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

Arthur Tsatryan appeals pro se from the district court’s order dismissing his action alleging federal and state law claims arising from state court divorce proceedings. 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)); *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003) (dismissal under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Tsatryan’s action because Tsatryan’s claims are a “de facto appeal” of prior state court judgments or are “inextricably intertwined” with those judgments, and Tsatryan did not allege facts sufficient to show that any alleged fraud on the court affected the state court judgments. *See Noel*, 341 F.3d at 1163-65 (discussing proper application of the *Rooker-Feldman*

---

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2)*.

doctrine); *see also Carmona v. Carmona*, 603 F.3d 1041, 1050-51 (9th Cir. 2010) (*Rooker-Feldman* doctrine barred plaintiff's claims seeking to enjoin state family court orders); *Kougasian v. TMSL, Inc.*, 359 F.3d 1136, 1140-41 (9th Cir. 2004) (discussing the extrinsic fraud exception to the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine).

All pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**