

**APPENDIX A**

Case: 16-17255 04/19/2018 DktEntry: 9

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**CHARLES G. KINNEY**  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

**ROGER W. BOREN; DAVID LANE,**  
Defendants-Appellees.

D.C. No. 3:16-cv-06505-VC No. Dist. of Cal., SF

**FILED**  
**APR 19 2018**  
**MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK**  
**U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**ORDER**

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

The panel has voted to deny the petition for  
panel rehearing.

The full court has been advised of the  
petition for rehearing en banc and no judge has  
requested a vote on whether to rehear the matter  
en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 35.

Kinney's petition for panel rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc (Docket Entry No. 8) are denied.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

**APPENDIX B**

Case: 16-17255 12/28/2017 DktEntry: 7

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**CHARLES G. KINNEY**  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

**ROGER W. BOREN; DAVID LANE,**  
Defendants-Appellees.

D.C. No. 3:16-cv-06505-VC No. Dist. of Cal., SF

**FILED**  
**DEC 28 2017**  
**MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK**  
**U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**MEMORANDUM \***

Appeal from the United States District Court for  
the Northern District of California Vince  
Chhabria, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 18, 2017\*\*

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

Charles G. Kinney appeals pro se from the  
district court's judgment dismissing sua sponte  
his action arising from a state appellate court  
order requiring Kinney to post a security bond.

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). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Kinney's action as barred by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because Kinney's claims amount to a forbidden "defacto appeal" of a prior state court judgment or are "inextricably intertwined" with that judgment. *See id.* at 1163-65 (discussing proper application of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Kinney's motion for a temporary restraining order. *See id.*; *Earth Island Inst. v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 351 F.3d 1291, 1298 (9th Cir. 2003) (setting forth standard of review).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing the complaint without leave to amend because amendment would be futile. *Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 656 F.3d 1034, 1041 (9th Cir. 2011) (setting forth standard of review and explaining that dismissal without leave to amend is proper when amendment would be futile).

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.**

\* 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). Kinney's request for oral argument, set forth in the opening brief, is denied.

No. \_\_\_\_

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE  
UNITED STATES

\_\_\_\_ ♦ \_\_\_\_  
CHARLES G. KINNEY,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

ROGER W. BOREN; DAVID LANE,  
*Respondents,*

\_\_\_\_ ♦ \_\_\_\_  
On Petition For Writ Of  
Certiorari To The  
Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals  
#16-17255 (April 19, 2018 denial  
of petition for rehearing) **[2 of 8]**

U.S. District Court, Northern  
District of Calif. (San Francisco)  
#3:16-cv-06505-VC

\_\_\_\_ ♦ \_\_\_\_  
**SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX  
FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

\_\_\_\_ ♦ \_\_\_\_  
CHARLES KINNEY  
Petitioner in pro se  
5826 Presley Way  
Oakland, CA 94618  
charleskinney@hotmail.com  
Telephone: 510-654-5133  
Fax: 510-594-0883

**INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX**

**Sequential No.**  
**In Document**

Supp. Appendix ("S") numbers at top of page

Appendix SA: Nov. 10, 2016 order by USDC Judge  
Chhabria denying application for temporary  
restraining order and dismissing complaint with  
prejudice *sua sponte* (Dk #12). . . . . 1

Appendix SB: Nov. 10, 2016 judgment by USDC  
Judge Chhabria for defendants (Dk #13) . . . . 4

**SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX SA**

Case 3:16-cv-06505-VC Dk 12 Filed 11/10/2016

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIF.

CHARLES KINNEY  
Plaintiff,

v.

ROGER W. BOREN, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-06505-VC

**ORDER DENYING APPLICATION FOR A  
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND  
DISMISSING COMPLAINT SUA SPONTE**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 1, 3, 7

Kinney's ex parte application for a temporary restraining order seeks in effect to reverse a California Court of Appeal decision requiring that Kinney post a security as a vexatious litigant.<sup>1</sup> See *Kempton v. Clarke*, No. B266125 (Cal. Ct. App. Oct 12, 2016); Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 391.1. Kinney has also filed a complaint, which rests on the same allegedly "erroneous decision by a state court." *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1164 (9th Cir. 2003). Neither action is proper in a federal district court, which doesn't sit in appeal of state-court decisions. *Id.*; see also *Cooper v. Ramos*, 704 F.3d 772, 779 (9th



Cir. 2012). Accordingly, Kinney's request for a restraining order is denied, and Kinney's complaint is dismissed with prejudice sua sponte. See *Franklin v. State of Or., State Welfare Div.*, 662 F.2d 1337, 1342 (9th Cir. 1981).

Kinney is cautioned against filing frivolous or bad-faith actions. Based on his history in the Northern District, Kinney should be well aware of the reasons claims of this kind can't proceed – lack of jurisdiction, sovereign immunity, and preclusion chief among them. See Order (Dkt. 33), *Kinney v. State Bar of Cal.*, No. 16-cv-02277-MMC (N.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2016); Order (Dkt. 9), *Kinney v. Lavin*, No. C 14-3817 PJH (N.D. Cal. Aug 22, 2014). Kinney has already been disbarred for his abusive litigation practices. See *In the Matter of Charles Gadsden Kinney*, Case Nos. 09-O-18100 (09-O-18760), at 14-15 (State Bar Ct. of Cal. Dec. 12, 2014). But even as a private pro se litigant, he may still be sanctioned under Rule 11 and 28 U.S.C. § 1927. *Wages v. I.R.S.*, 915 F.2d 1230, 1235-36 (9th Cir. 1990).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: November 10, 2016

s/  
VINCE CHHABRIA  
United States District Judge

Fn 1 Kinney has been declared a vexatious litigant in California Superior Court and at the California Court of Appeal. *Kempton v. Clark*, No. B248713, 2014 WL 4772269, at \*1 (Cal. Ct. App.

Sept. 25, 2014), reh'g denied (Oct. 14, 2014), review denied (Dec. 17, 2014); *In re Kinney*, 201 Cal. App. 4th 951, 960 (2011). He has also been declared a vexatious litigant in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. Order (Dkt. 70), *Kinney v. Cooper*, No. 15-cv-8910 (C.D. Cal. May 13, 2016).

**SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX SB**

Case 3:16-cv-06505-VC Dk 13 Filed 11/10/2016

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIF.

CHARLES KINNEY  
Plaintiff,

v.

ROGER W. BOREN, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-06505-VC

**JUDGMENT**

Having dismissed this case with prejudice, the Court now enters judgment in favor of the defendants and against the plaintiff. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: November 10, 2016

\_\_\_\_s/\_\_\_\_

VINCE CHHABRIA

United States District Judge