

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 19 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

SAFRON HUOT,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

MONTANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF  
CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 18-35138

D.C. No. 2:17-cv-00060-BMM

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Montana  
Brian M. Morris, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 12, 2018\*\*

Before: RAWLINSON, CLIFTON, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Safron Huot appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her action alleging 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims related to the termination of her parental rights. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo.

*Wilhelm v. Rotman*, 680 F.3d 1113, 1118 (9th Cir. 2012) (dismissal under 28

---

\* 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).

U.S.C. § 1915A); *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003) (dismissal under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine); *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Huot’s action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because Huot’s claims constituted a forbidden “de facto appeal” of a prior state court judgment or were “inextricably intertwined” with that judgment. *See Noel*, 341 F.3d at 1163-65 (9th Cir. 2003) (discussing proper application of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine); *see also Henrichs v. Valley View Dev.*, 474 F.3d 609, 616 (9th Cir. 2007) (*Rooker-Feldman* doctrine barred plaintiff’s claim because the relief sought “would require the district court to determine that the state court’s decision was wrong and thus void”).

**AFFIRMED.**