FILED

NOV 02 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARGARET MELINDA SPRAGUE, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA (MBC); et al., Defendants - Appellees.	No. 09-56136 D.C. No. 3:07-cv-01561-JLS-LSP MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Janis L. Sammartino, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 19, 2010**

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, LEAVY, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges.

Margaret Melinda Sprague appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action arising from the revocation of her license

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

to practice medicine. We have jurisdiction under to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315 F.3d 1108, 1117 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Sprague's claims seeking damages and retrospective equitable relief against the Medical Board of California and the individual defendants because her claims were barred by various doctrines of immunity. *See Briscoe v. LaHue*, 460 U.S. 325, 335 (1983) (witnesses are "integral parts of the judicial process" and are shielded by immunity); *Olsen v. Idaho State Bd. of Med.*, 363 F.3d 916, 923 (9th Cir. 2004) ("agency representatives performing functions analogous to those of a . . . judge" are immune from civil damages suits); *Prod. & Leasing, Ltd. v. Hotel Conquistador, Inc.*, 709 F.2d 21, 21-22 (9th Cir. 1983) (per curiam) (Eleventh Amendment immunity applies to actions naming state agencies or state officials sued in their official capacity).

The district court properly dismissed Sprague's claim seeking prospective equitable relief because the defendants could not effectuate the requested relief. *See Demery v. Kupperman*, 735 F.2d 1139, 1143, 1151 (9th Cir. 1984).

We do not consider Sprague's claims raised for the first time on appeal. *See Bias v. Moynihan*, 508 F.3d 1212, 1223 (9th Cir. 2007).

Sprague's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

Sprague's motions seeking judicial notice are denied.

AFFIRMED.