

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

RAJESH K. SINHA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

ANTONY J. BLINKEN, United States Secretary of State, XAVIER BECERRA, United States Secretary of Health and Human Services, TANGULER GRAY, Commissioner of the Office of Child Support Services, MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General, United States Attorney General, APRIL THOMAS, California Department of Child Support Services, DAVID KILGORE, Director, California Department of Child Support Services, SHANNON RICHARDS, California Department of Child Support Services, SELIS KOKAR, California Department of Child Support Services, MARTIN HOSHINO, Judicial Council Administrative Director,

No. 25-3643

D.C. No. 4:24-cv-00046-HSG

MEMORANDUM*

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 29, 2026**

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

Rajesh K. Sinha appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging federal claims arising from child support orders. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Sato v. Orange County Dep't of Educ.*, 861 F.3d 923, 928 (9th Cir. 2017) (dismissal based on Eleventh Amendment Immunity); *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Sinha's claims against the State of California and its agencies because they are entitled to Eleventh Amendment immunity. *See id.* (explaining that agencies of the state are immune under the Eleventh Amendment from private damages or suits for injunctive relief).

The district court properly dismissed Sinha's claims against the individually named defendants because Sinha failed to allege facts sufficient to state any

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).*

plausible claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (“To survive a motion to dismiss, 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 arguments and allegations raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.