NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

JUN 26 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ISAIAS VASQUEZ, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. JOSE ORTEGA; J. THICH; D. VILLANUEVA; Y. DELGADO; A. GOMEZ; M. ROMERO; DOE ROMERO, Defendants - Appellees.	No. 24-6614 D.C. No. 5:24-cv-01386-PCP MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
P. Casey Pitts, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 22, 2026**

Before: CANBY, BENNETT, and BADE, Circuit Judges.

Isaias Vasquez, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging harassment by prison employees. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de

---

* 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).

novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. *Mangiaracina v. Penzone*, 849 F.3d 1191, 1195 (9th Cir. 2017). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Vasquez's action because Vasquez failed to allege facts sufficient to state a plausible claim. *See Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (although pro se pleadings are construed liberally, a plaintiff must present factual allegations sufficient to state a plausible claim for relief); *Rodriguez v. County of Los Angeles*, 891 F.3d 776, 798 (9th Cir. 2018) (discussing supervisory liability under § 1983); *Keenan v. Hall*, 83 F.3d 1083, 1092 (9th Cir. 1996) (explaining that "verbal harassment generally does not violate the Eighth Amendment").

All pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.