

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 2 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RICHARD N. URIAS, Citizens of the
several States in same status and situs,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BARACK OBAMA, President of the U.S.;
et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 15-55211

D.C. No. 3:14-cv-02598-BTM-
BLM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Barry Ted Moskowitz, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 25, 2016**

Before: LEAVY, GRABER, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Richard N. Urias appeals pro se from the district court's judgment
dismissing for lack of standing his action alleging various claims arising from
defendants' alleged failure to act in accordance with the United States

* 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).

Constitution. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *Hayes v. County of San Diego*, 736 F.3d 1223, 1228 (9th Cir. 2013), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Urias’ action because Urias failed to plead a particularized injury necessary to establish Article III standing. *See Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 573-76 (1992). (“[A]n injury amounting only to the alleged violation of a right to have the Government act in accordance with law was not judicially cognizable because assertion of a right to a particular kind of Government conduct, which the Government has violated by acting differently, cannot alone satisfy the requirements of Art. III without draining those requirements of meaning.” (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Urias’ motion for judicial notice, filed on June 26, 2016, is denied.

AFFIRMED.