

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 30 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

KIM EDWARD ROGERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JIM COOPER, Sacramento County Sheriff,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

ROB BONTA, California Attorney General,
GUADALUPE SANCHEZ, Manager,
California sex offender registry, SCOTT
JONES, Sacramento Sheriff,

Defendants.

No. 24-5546

D.C. No. 2:22-cv-01157-TLN-JDP

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Troy L. Nunley, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 29, 2026**

Before: McKEOWN, TALLMAN, and MENDOZA, JR., Circuit Judges.

* 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).

Kim Edward Rogers appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional violations related to California registration requirements for sex offenders. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal for failure to state a claim under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). *Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341 (9th Cir. 2010). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Rogers's action because Rogers 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)).

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

All pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.