NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

ICHI WU, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. DYLAN SULLIVAN; SHELLY HOWE, Defendants - Appellees.	No. 25-3557 D.C. No. 2:25-cv-00164-DC-JDP MEMORANDUM[*]

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Dena M. Coggins, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 27, 2026[**]

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

Ichi Wu appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her action stemming from an eviction. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012)

[*] 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).

(dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)); *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003) (dismissal under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Wu's action because it was barred by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, or Wu otherwise failed to satisfy her burden of establishing subject matter jurisdiction. *See Noel*, 341 F.3d at 1163-65 (discussing proper application of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine; explaining that "[i]f a federal plaintiff asserts as a legal wrong an allegedly erroneous decision by a state court, and seeks relief from a state court judgment based on that decision, *Rooker-Feldman* bars subject matter jurisdiction in federal court"); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (setting forth requirements for federal question jurisdiction); 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (setting forth requirements for diversity jurisdiction); *Bishop Paiute Tribe v. Inyo County*, 863 F.3d 1144, 1151 (9th Cir. 2017) ("The party asserting jurisdiction bears the burden of establishing subject matter jurisdiction." (citation omitted)).

We do not consider arguments raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009). We do not consider documents or facts not presented to the district court. *See United States v. Elias*, 92 F.2d 870, 874 (9th Cir. 1990).

AFFIRMED.