

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 16 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ELIZABETH WILLIAMS, an unmarried
woman,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LEVI KHAN, an Arizona Resident
Individually and in his Official Capacity as
DCS case worker; ERIKA CAMPAS, an
Arizona Resident; GARY ROSEBECK, an
Arizona Resident; JAMES DAVIS, an
Arizona Resident; UNKNOWN PARTIES,
named as John and Jane Does 1-100,

Defendants - Appellees,

ROSETTE CODNER, an Arizona Resident,
CITY OF TUCSON, a state municipality,

Defendants.

No. 24-6265

D.C. No.

4:17-cv-00029-EJM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Eric Markovich, Magistrate Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 29, 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: BUMATAY, SANCHEZ, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Elizabeth Williams appeals the district court’s award of attorneys’ fees in her favor. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review the district court’s award of attorneys’ fees for abuse of discretion, and we review whether the district court applied the correct legal standard de novo. *Roberts v. City of Honolulu*, 938 F.3d 1020, 1023 (9th Cir. 2019). We affirm.

Williams does not directly argue that the district court erred in its fees award or calculation. She instead argues that attorneys involved in the case—including her own prior attorneys, for whose work she requested attorneys’ fees—miscalculated or misrepresented their fees and that attorneys generally misuse fees. The district court conducted a thorough analysis of the reasonableness of the fee award under 42 U.S.C. § 1988. Because Williams does not explain what error she believes the district court made, much less point to any abuse of the district court’s discretion, we will not reverse the district court’s award of fees.¹ Williams also fails to raise any additional arguments that we may consider. *See Blumenkron v. Multnomah County*, 91 F.4th 1303, 1317 (9th Cir. 2024); *see also Acosta-Huerta v.*

¹ To the extent Williams challenges the district court’s denial of her motions related to disclosing the costs to taxpayers of this litigation, she has forfeited such claims as they are “vague, unsupported by any citations to case authority, and untethered to the applicable legal standards.” *Blumenkron v. Multnomah County*, 91 F.4th 1303, 1317 (9th Cir. 2024).

Estelle, 7 F.3d 139, 144 (9th Cir. 1992), *as amended* (Oct. 8, 1993) (deeming abandoned issues not supported by argument in pro se appellant's opening brief).

AFFIRMED.²

² Williams's motions for miscellaneous relief (Dkt. Nos. 46, 47) are denied.