NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

OCT 29 2018

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ROBERT J. KULICK, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. LEISURE VILLAGE ASSOCIATION, INC., Defendant-Appellee.	No. 18-55904 D.C. No. 2:18-cv-03392-PA-SS MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Percy Anderson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 22, 2018**

Before: SILVERMAN, GRABER, and GOULD, Circuit Judges.

Robert J. Kulick appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging civil rights violations arising from state court proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under the *Rooker–Feldman* doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003).

* 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).

We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker–Feldman* doctrine because Kulick's action is a "de facto appeal" of a prior state court judgment, and he raises claims that are "inextricably intertwined" with that judgment. *Cooper v. Ramos*, 704 F.3d 772, 782 (9th Cir. 2012) (*Rooker–Feldman* doctrine barred claim that was "inextricably intertwined" with the state court's decision); *see Henrichs v. Valley View Dev.*, 474 F.3d 609, 616 (9th Cir. 2007) (*Rooker–Feldman* doctrine barred plaintiff's claim because alleged legal injuries arose from the "state court's purportedly erroneous judgment" and the relief sought "would require the district court to determine that the state court's decision was wrong and thus void").

AFFIRMED.