NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

AMIR ABDUL-ALIM; HAFSA ELARFAOUI, On their own behalf and On behalf of their minor children, A.A.A. and I.A.A.,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT; CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES; NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-2659

D.C. No. 2:23-cv-01677-MMD-NJK

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada
Miranda M. Du, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 27, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, FORREST, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Plaintiffs appeal pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing sua

* 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).

sponte their action alleging federal and state law claims in connection with the education of two minor children. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

Because plaintiffs Abdul-Alim and Elarfaoui fail to address the district court's grounds for dismissal of their claims in the 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).

The district court properly dismissed the claims brought by the minor plaintiffs for failure to obtain counsel. *See Johns v. County of San Diego*, 114 F.3d 874, 876-77 (9th Cir. 1997) (setting forth standard of review and holding that "a parent or guardian cannot bring an action on behalf of a minor child without retaining a lawyer"); *see also Grizzell v. San Elijo Elementary Sch.*, 110 F.4th 1177, 1179-81 (9th Cir. 2024) (rejecting statutory, constitutional, and policy challenges to the rule prohibiting parents from representing their children pro se).

We reject as meritless plaintiffs' contentions that the district court was biased, violated plaintiffs' rights, and was required to enter default judgment. We reject as unsupported by the record plaintiffs' contentions concerning fraud on the

court.

We do not consider plaintiffs' contentions concerning their prior appeal because they are outside of scope of this appeal.

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

All pending requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.