

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 25 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MICHAEL TROY WILKES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT
DISTRICT; REDI-WHEELS;
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION; SAN FRANCISCO
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT;
SAN MATEO COUNTY EVENT
CENTER; UNITED AIRLINES, INC.;
DELTA AIR LINES, INC.; AIRBNB, INC.;
U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION;
SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERIOR
COURT; SAN MATEO POLICE
DEPARTMENT; CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-7526

D.C. No. 3:25-cv-06224-TLT

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California

Trina L. Thompson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 22, 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: OWENS, COLLINS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Michael Troy Wilkes appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing his action alleging federal and state law claims in connection with his attempts to use inline skates as a mobility aid. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)); *Al-Torki v. Kaempfen*, 78 F.3d 1381, 1384 (9th Cir. 1996) (dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b)). We may affirm on any basis supported by the record. *Thompson v. Paul*, 547 F.3d 1055, 1058-59 (9th Cir. 2008). We affirm.

Dismissal of Wilkes's action was not an abuse of discretion because Wilkes failed to comply with the district court's orders regarding service. *See Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 640-43 (9th Cir. 2002) (discussing factors to be considered before dismissing a case for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with a court order).

Wilkes's challenge to the district court's denial of his motions for preliminary injunctive relief is moot. *See Mt. Graham Red Squirrel v. Madigan*, 954 F.2d 1441, 1450 (9th Cir. 1992) (explaining that when underlying claims have been decided, the reversal of a denial of preliminary injunctive relief would have no practical consequences, and the issue is therefore moot).

We reject as meritless Wilkes's contentions that the district court denied

Wilkes due process or access to the courts.

AFFIRMED.