

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 15 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

WILLIAM A. GRAVEN, Named as Will,

No. 22-16909

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:22-cv-00062-GMS

v.

MEMORANDUM*

MARK BRNOVICH, Attorney General,
Attorney General; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
G. Murray Snow, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 12, 2023**

Before: WALLACE, LEE, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

William A. Graven appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action alleging federal and state law claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a district court's dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b) for lack of standing. *Shulman v. Kaplan*, 58 F.4th 404, 407 (9th

* 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).

Cir. 2023). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Graven’s action because Graven failed to allege facts sufficient to demonstrate Article III standing. *See Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992) (setting forth requirements for constitutional standing); *Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973) (“[A] private citizen lacks a judicially cognizable interest in the prosecution or nonprosecution of another.”).

We reject as without merit Graven’s contention that the district court was biased against him.

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).

All pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.