

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 21 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ROBERT MICHAEL LINDBLAD,

No. 22-16200

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:21-cv-06606-SI

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

CARLOS G. BOLANOS, Chief; ANDREW  
CONSTENTINO, Officer; JIMMY CHUNG;  
AZAR, Officer; CHEUNG, Officer;  
COUNTY COMMISSION OF SAN  
MATEO COUNTY; SAN MATEO  
COUNTY; JENNIFER ANN STALZER;  
CHENG, Officer; CITY OF MILLBRAE;  
SAFEWAY GROCERY OUTLET,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Susan Illston, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 14, 2023\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, WARDLAW, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges.

Robert Michael Lindblad appeals pro se from the district court's judgment

---

\* 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).

dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging a variety of police misconduct. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Thompson v. Paul*, 547 F.3d 1055, 1058 (9th Cir. 2008) (dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)); *Pickern v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.), Inc.*, 457 F.3d 963, 968 (9th Cir. 2006) (dismissal for failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Lindblad’s action because after an opportunity to amend, Lindblad’s operative complaint failed to comply with Rule 8. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) (a pleading must contain “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that a pleader is entitled to relief”); *Hatch v. Reliance Ins. Co.*, 758 F.2d 409, 415 (9th Cir. 1985) (upholding a Rule 8(a) dismissal of a complaint that “exceeded 70 pages in length, [and was] confusing and conclusory”); *Nevijel v. N. Coast Life Ins. Co.*, 651 F.2d 671, 674 (9th Cir. 1981) (a complaint that is “verbose, confusing and conclusory” violates Rule 8).

We reject as without merit Lindblad’s contentions concerning a default judgment, sanctions, and slip opinions.

All pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**