

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 14 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

PRAVEEN KHURANA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

STATE OF IDAHO; DOUGLAS
FLEENOR; ROBERT RINARD; DAPHNE
HUANG; RENU VERMA, and John Doe
(Wife and Husband); VIMAL VERMA, and
Jane Doe (Husband and wife); KAMAL
VERMA, and Jane Doe (Husband and wife);
NEELAM KAKKAR, Wife and Husband;
ARUN KAKKAR, Wife and Husband;
DOREEN SULTMA, and spouse of Doreen
Sulyma,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-35964

D.C. No. 3:18-cv-00553-DCN

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Idaho
David C. Nye, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 8, 2022**

Before: WALLACE, TALLMAN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

* 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).

Praveen Khurana appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging various claims related to child support payments. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Khurana's action because Khurana failed to allege facts sufficient to state a plausible claim. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (to avoid dismissal, "a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

To the extent that Khurana contends that the district court was biased against him or failed to review his amended complaints, we reject his contentions as unsupported by the record.

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.