

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 7 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JERAMY MICHAEL STEVENS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COUNTY OF NEVADA; BRANDI
JONES; MARIANNA BREWER;
SHANNON MOON, Sheriff; JASON
MACKEY,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-6980

D.C. No. 2:23-cv-01830-KJM-CKD

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Kimberly J. Mueller, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2026**

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

Jeramy Michael Stevens appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging various claims in connection with

* 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).

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)(B). *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Stevens’s action because Stevens failed to allege facts sufficient to state any plausible claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (explaining that, to avoid dismissal, “a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying further leave to amend because amendment would have been futile. *See Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 656 F.3d 1034, 1041 (9th Cir. 2011) (setting forth standard of review and explaining that leave to amend may be denied when amendment would be futile); *Metzler Inv. GMBH v. Corinthian Colls., Inc.*, 540 F.3d 1049, 1072 (9th Cir. 2008) (explaining that “the district court’s discretion to deny leave to amend is particularly broad where plaintiff has previously amended the complaint” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

The motion (Docket Entry No. 7) for appointment of counsel is denied. The motion (Docket Entry No. 15) for permission to file a supplemental brief is granted in part. The clerk will file the supplemental brief at Docket Entry No. 16. All other

requests in Docket Entry No. 15 are denied.

AFFIRMED.