

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 3 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CAMMIE L. MARCEAUX,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COUNTY OF MARICOPA; STATE OF
ARIZONA,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-1977

D.C. No. 2:24-cv-01107-MTL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Michael T. Liburdi, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 29, 2026**

Before: McKEOWN, TALLMAN, and MENDOZA, JR, Circuit Judges.

Cammie L. Marceaux appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging claims related to real property in Arizona. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a

* 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 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Marceaux’s action because, despite an opportunity to amend, the amended 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 the pleader is entitled to relief”); *Nevijel v. N. Coast Life Ins. Co.*, 651 F.2d 671, 674 (9th Cir. 1981) (explaining that a complaint that is “verbose, confusing and conclusory” violates Rule 8).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing without leave to amend because amendment would be futile. *See 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).

All pending motions and requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.