NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

MICHAEL D. REEVES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT; ALEJANDRO NICOLAS MAYORKAS; FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY; PREMISE DATA CORPORATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

Nos. 25-4586
25-4975

D.C. No. 2:25-cv-06312-JLS-DTB

MEMORANDUM*

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Josephine L. Staton, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 27, 2026**

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

The motions (Docket Entry No. 5 in Appeal No. 25-4586; Docket Entry No.

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

** The panel unanimously concludes these cases are suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

5 in Appeal No. 25-4975) to proceed in forma pauperis are granted.

Michael D. Reeves appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing his action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a district court's dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 12(h)(3). *Carolina Cas. Ins. Co. v. Team Equip., Inc.*, 741 F.3d 1082, 1086 (9th Cir. 2014). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Reeves's claims relating to third-party surveillance and harassment because his claims were "wholly insubstantial and frivolous" and thus failed to confer federal subject matter jurisdiction. *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't*, 523 U.S. 83, 89 (1998) (explaining that an action may be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction where the alleged federal claim is "wholly insubstantial and frivolous" or so "otherwise completely devoid of merit as not to involve a federal controversy" (citations omitted)).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in striking Reeves's petition for writ of habeas corpus. *See S. Cal. Edison Co. v. Lynch*, 307 F.3d 794, 807 (9th Cir. 2002) (stating that "district courts have inherent power to control their dockets" and this court "will reverse a district court's litigation management decisions only if it abused its discretion" (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)).

All other pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.