NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JANETTE L. GORDON, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION, Defendant - Appellee.	No. 14-15661 D.C. No. 4:13-cv-02370-DCB MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
David C. Bury, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 9, 2015**

Before: WALLACE, RAWLINSON, and IKUTA, Circuit Judges.

Janette L. Gordon appeals pro se from the district court's judgment in her action arising from the impounding of her car. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C.

---

* 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).

§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Gordon's action because the allegations in Gordon's complaint failed to state a claim. *See Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (although pro se pleadings are to be liberally construed, a plaintiff must present factual allegations sufficient to state a plausible claim for relief). Moreover, to the extent that Gordon sought to bring an action under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), no *Bivens* remedy is available against a federal agency. *See W. Radio Servs. Co. v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 578 F.3d 1116, 1119 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.