

FILED

JAN 25 2001

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ROGER W. KNIGHT,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

NORM MALENG, King County
Prosecuting Attorney; CALVIN G.
RAPADA, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 00-35625

D.C. No. CV-00-00151-TSZ

MEMORANDUM¹

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Thomas S. Zilly, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 8, 2001²

Before: BEEZER, O'SCANNLAIN, and KLEINFELD, Circuit Judges.

Roger W. Knight appeals pro se the district court's summary judgment for defendants dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, which sought to enjoin a state

¹ This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as may be provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

² The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2). Accordingly, appellant's request for oral argument is denied.

court contempt proceeding to enforce a court order that Knight make child support payments. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a denial of an injunction based on *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971). *See Kenneally v. Lungren*, 967 F.2d 329, 331 (9th Cir. 1992). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Knight's action pursuant to the *Younger* abstention doctrine because the state court proceedings were ongoing, implicated important state interests, and provided an adequate opportunity for Knight to litigate his federal claims. *See Delta Dental Plan of Cal., Inc. v. Mendoza*, 139 F.3d 1289, 1294 (9th Cir. 1998). Because the district court properly dismissed the action pursuant to the *Younger* abstention doctrine, we do not address Knight's remaining contentions concerning the district court's alternative grounds for dismissal. *See id.*

AFFIRMED.