NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

OCT 30 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

BRYANT FARNHAM, AKA B.F., AKA John Doe,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT; STATE OF CALIFORNIA; CITY OF RIVERSIDE; CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS; WORKERS COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD - DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION; CALIFORNIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-2573

D.C. No. 2:25-cv-02159-AH-BFM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Anne Hwang, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 27, 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: SILVERMAN, FORREST, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Bryant Farnham appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP"). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

Because Farnham does not challenge the district court's grounds for denying IFP in his opening brief, we do not consider that decision. *See Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Washington*, 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003) (explaining that "we will not consider any claims that were not actually argued in appellant's opening brief"); *Acosta-Huerta v. Estelle*, 7 F.3d 139, 144 (9th Cir. 1992), *as amended* (Oct. 8, 1993) (explaining that issues not supported by argument in pro se appellant's opening brief are deemed abandoned).

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).

All pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.