

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 23 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

LOUIS AREN WOLF,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF ABERDEEN; LISA D. SCOTT,
Community Development Director, City of
Aberdeen; WILLIAM SIDOR, Assistant
Community Development Director, City of
Aberdeen; GARY M. SEXTON, Police
Officer, City of Aberdeen; ROSS
LAMPKEY, Police Officer, City of
Aberdeen; CHARLES W. CHASTAIN,
Police Officer, City of Aberdeen,

Defendants - Appellees,

PETER J. SHAVE, KYLE HOFFMAN,
LINDY A. DANSARE, FOREST W.
WORGUM III, DILLION M. MITCHELL,

Defendants.

No. 25-1817

D.C. No.

3:23-cv-05954-TMC

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Tiffany M. Cartwright, District Judge, Presiding

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

Submitted September 22, 2026**

Before: OWENS, COLLINS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Louis Aren Wolf appeals pro se from the district court’s summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Lassiter v. City of Bremerton*, 556 F.3d 1049, 1053 (9th Cir. 2009). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment on Wolf’s malicious prosecution claims because Wolf failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether the prosecution was not supported by probable cause. *See Lassiter*, 556 F.3d at 1054-55 (setting forth elements of a malicious prosecution claim under § 1983 and Washington law, and explaining that “probable cause is an absolute defense to malicious prosecution”); *see also Gordon v. County of Orange*, 6 F.4th 961, 973 (9th Cir. 2021) (setting forth elements of a § 1983 claim for municipal liability under *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978), including the violation of a constitutional right).

We reject as unsupported by the record Wolf’s contention that the district court prevented him from presenting evidence.

AFFIRMED.

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