

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 6 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

EDWARD PLUMMER, Jr., an individual,  
and as Successor In Interest of Eula Dugas  
Haughton, deceased,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, a public  
entity; JONATHAN SHERIN, in  
individual/official capacity; FERNANDO  
PIAZOLA, in individual/official capacity;  
WILLIAM SIAS, in individual/official  
capacity; CONNIE DRAXLER, in  
individual/official capacity; ANGELICA  
MELGAR, in individual/official capacity;  
DOES, 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-6352

D.C. No. 2:20-cv-04568-SB-AGR

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 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: LEE, DESAI, and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

Edward Plummer, Jr., appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his action under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985 alleging constitutional violations stemming from a conservatorship. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

Because Plummer fails to address in his opening brief the district court's grounds for summary judgment on his First Amendment retaliation claim or for dismissal of his other claims, we do not consider those decisions. *See Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Washington*, 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[W]e will not consider any claims that were not actually argued in appellant’s opening brief.”).

We reject as without merit Plummer’s contentions that the district court improperly denied discovery.

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

**AFFIRMED.**