NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

DEC 15 2022

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARVIN CARRERA, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. RHONDA K. FORSBERG, Defendant-Appellee.	No. 21-16582 D.C. No. 2:20-cv-02138-GMN-EJY MEMORANDUM[*]

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada
Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 8, 2022[**]

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

Marvin Carrera appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging various federal claims arising from state court child custody proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 656 F.3d 1034, 1040 (9th Cir. 2011)

[*] 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).

(dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6)); *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003) (dismissal under *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Carrera's action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because it was a "forbidden de facto appeal" of a prior state court decision and raised issues that were "inextricably intertwined" with that decision. *See Noel*, 341 F.3d at 1163-65 (discussing the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine); *see also Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005) (explaining that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine is limited to "cases brought by state-court losers complaining of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court proceedings commenced and inviting district court review and rejection of those judgments"); *Cooper v. Ramos*, 704 F.3d 772, 782 (9th Cir. 2012) (explaining that claims are "inextricably intertwined" with state court decisions where federal adjudication "would impermissibly undercut the state ruling on the same issues" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

We do not consider arguments and allegations raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.