

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 8 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ROY B. CONANT,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

KATE BROWN, Governor, State of  
Oregon; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 17-35349

D.C. No. 3:16-cv-02290-HZ

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Oregon  
Marco A. Hernandez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 6, 2018\*\*

Before: TROTT, SILVERMAN, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges

Roy B. Conant appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing for lack of standing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action challenging various Oregon voting laws. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo the district court's standing determination, *Nat'l Council of La Raza v. Cegavske*, 800

---

\* 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).

F.3d 1032, 1039 (9th Cir. 2015), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Conant’s action for lack of standing because Conant failed to allege an injury in fact. *See Rubin v. City of Santa Monica*, 308 F.3d 1008, 1020 (9th Cir. 2002) (plaintiff’s challenges to state election laws “as a voter and a citizen” did not constitute an injury in fact). “To establish standing, . . . the injury must be more than a generalized grievance common to all members of the public.” *Id.*; *see also Schlesinger v. Reservists Comm. to Stop the War*, 418 U.S. 208, 216–27, 94 S.Ct. 2925, 41 L.Ed.2d 706 (1974).

We do not consider on appeal any issues not raised before the district court. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

**AFFIRMED.**