

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 28 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

AMIA L. BRYANT,

No. 23-15287

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:22-cv-01308-TLN-KJN

v.

MEMORANDUM*

DARRELL STEINBURG, Mayor; MARY LYNNE VELLINGA, Chief of Staff; ALLEN WAYNE WARREN, City Councilman, District 2; TAMERA VALLEJO, Creator, CEO, E49 Compassion Village; LARRY JOYNER, St. Pauls Church (Pearl); LASHELLE DOZIER, Director, Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency; TYRONE WILLIAMS, Assistant Director Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency; APRIL ORVILLE, Housing Liaison, Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency; COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY; ANGELIQUE ASHBY, Councilwoman, Sacramento City Council,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Troy L. Nunley, District Judge, Presiding

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

Submitted February 21, 2024**

Before: FERNANDEZ, NGUYEN, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Amia L. Bryant appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her action alleging discrimination under the Fair Housing Act and other claims in connection with a government housing program. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Bryant's Fair Housing Act claims because Bryant failed to allege facts sufficient to show that defendants discriminated against her on the basis of a protected status. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 3604 (setting forth protected grounds under the Fair Housing Act); *Avenue 6E Inv., LLC v. City of Yuma, Ariz.*, 818 F.3d 493, 502-03 (9th Cir. 2016) (explaining that the Fair Housing Act requires either intentional discrimination because of a person's protected characteristic or a discriminatory effect on a protected class).

We reject as unsupported by the record Bryant's contentions that the district court violated her constitutional rights.

We do not consider arguments and allegations raised for the first time on appeal or documents not filed with the district court. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587

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

F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Elias*, 921 F.2d 870, 874 (9th Cir. 1990).

All pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.