NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 29 2021

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

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PATRICIA GROSSMAN,

No. 20-15356

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 1:18-cv-00493-DKW-RT

v.

MEMORANDUM*

HAWAII GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION, AFSCME LOCAL 152,AFL-CIO; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees,

and

RUSSELL A. SUZUKI, in his official capacity as Attorney General of Hawaii,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii Derrick Kahala Watson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 19, 2021**

Before: SCHROEDER, SILVERMAN, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

^{*} 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).

Patricia Grossman appeals from the district court's summary judgment in her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging a First Amendment claim arising out of union membership dues. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a decision on cross motions for summary judgment. *JL Beverage Co., LLC v. Jim Beam Brands Co.*, 828 F.3d 1098, 1104 (9th Cir. 2016). We may affirm on any ground supported by the record. *Enlow v. Salem-Keizer Yellow Cab Co.*, 389 F.3d 802, 811 (9th Cir. 2004). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment on Grossman's claim seeking prospective relief because such claim is moot. *See Bain v. Cal. Teachers Ass'n*, 891 F.3d 1206, 1211-15 (9th Cir. 2018) (finding plaintiffs' claims for prospective relief moot when they resigned their union membership and presented no reasonable likelihood that they would rejoin the union in the future).

The district court properly dismissed Grossman's First Amendment claim challenging the exclusive bargaining representation arrangement for Hawaii public employees because Grossman failed to allege a plausible claim. *See Mentele v. Inslee*, 916 F.3d 783, 790-91 (9th Cir. 2019) (holding that exclusive bargaining arrangement is constitutionally permissible); *Bain*, 891 F.3d at 1211 (setting forth standard of review for motion to dismiss).

The parties agree that this court's intervening decision in *Belgau v. Inslee*, 975 F.3d 940 (9th Cir. 2020), *cert. denied*, No. 20-1120, 2021 WL 2519114 (June

20-15356

21, 2021), controls the outcome of Grossman's First Amendment claim arising from the collection of union dues under her membership agreement. We affirm the district court's summary judgment because Grossman affirmatively and voluntarily consented to the deduction of union dues. *See Belgau*, 975 F.3d at 950-52 (concluding that the Supreme Court's decision in *Janus v. American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees, Council 31*, 138 S. Ct. 2448 (2018), did not extend a First Amendment right to avoid paying union dues that were agreed upon under validly entered union membership agreements).

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.

3 20-15356

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Office of the Clerk

95 Seventh Street San Francisco, CA 94103

Information Regarding Judgment and Post-Judgment Proceedings

Judgment

• This Court has filed and entered the attached judgment in your case. Fed. R. App. P. 36. Please note the filed date on the attached decision because all of the dates described below run from that date, not from the date you receive this notice.

Mandate (Fed. R. App. P. 41; 9th Cir. R. 41-1 & -2)

• The mandate will issue 7 days after the expiration of the time for filing a petition for rehearing or 7 days from the denial of a petition for rehearing, unless the Court directs otherwise. To file a motion to stay the mandate, file it electronically via the appellate ECF system or, if you are a pro se litigant or an attorney with an exemption from using appellate ECF, file one original motion on paper.

Petition for Panel Rehearing (Fed. R. App. P. 40; 9th Cir. R. 40-1) Petition for Rehearing En Banc (Fed. R. App. P. 35; 9th Cir. R. 35-1 to -3)

(1) A. Purpose (Panel Rehearing):

- A party should seek panel rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:
 - ► A material point of fact or law was overlooked in the decision;
 - A change in the law occurred after the case was submitted which appears to have been overlooked by the panel; or
 - An apparent conflict with another decision of the Court was not addressed in the opinion.
- Do not file a petition for panel rehearing merely to reargue the case.

B. Purpose (Rehearing En Banc)

• A party should seek en banc rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:

- ► Consideration by the full Court is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions; or
- ► The proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance; or
- The opinion directly conflicts with an existing opinion by another court of appeals or the Supreme Court and substantially affects a rule of national application in which there is an overriding need for national uniformity.

(2) Deadlines for Filing:

- A petition for rehearing may be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party in a civil case, the time for filing a petition for rehearing is 45 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the mandate has issued, the petition for rehearing should be accompanied by a motion to recall the mandate.
- *See* Advisory Note to 9th Cir. R. 40-1 (petitions must be received on the due date).
- An order to publish a previously unpublished memorandum disposition extends the time to file a petition for rehearing to 14 days after the date of the order of publication or, in all civil cases in which the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party, 45 days after the date of the order of publication. 9th Cir. R. 40-2.

(3) Statement of Counsel

• A petition should contain an introduction stating that, in counsel's judgment, one or more of the situations described in the "purpose" section above exist. The points to be raised must be stated clearly.

(4) Form & Number of Copies (9th Cir. R. 40-1; Fed. R. App. P. 32(c)(2))

- The petition shall not exceed 15 pages unless it complies with the alternative length limitations of 4,200 words or 390 lines of text.
- The petition must be accompanied by a copy of the panel's decision being challenged.
- An answer, when ordered by the Court, shall comply with the same length limitations as the petition.
- If a pro se litigant elects to file a form brief pursuant to Circuit Rule 28-1, a petition for panel rehearing or for rehearing en banc need not comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32.

Case: 20-15356, 07/29/2021, ID: 12186487, DktEntry: 40-2, Page 3 of 4

- The petition or answer must be accompanied by a Certificate of Compliance found at Form 11, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.
- You may file a petition electronically via the appellate ECF system. No paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise. If you are a pro se litigant or an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, file one original petition on paper. No additional paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise.

Bill of Costs (Fed. R. App. P. 39, 9th Cir. R. 39-1)

- The Bill of Costs must be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment.
- See Form 10 for additional information, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.

Attorneys Fees

- Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1 describes the content and due dates for attorneys fees applications.
- All relevant forms are available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms* or by telephoning (415) 355-7806.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari

 Please refer to the Rules of the United States Supreme Court at www.supremecourt.gov

Counsel Listing in Published Opinions

- Please check counsel listing on the attached decision.
- If there are any errors in a published <u>opinion</u>, please send a letter **in writing** within 10 days to:
 - ► Thomson Reuters; 610 Opperman Drive; PO Box 64526; Eagan, MN 55123 (Attn: Jean Green, Senior Publications Coordinator);
 - ▶ and electronically file a copy of the letter via the appellate ECF system by using "File Correspondence to Court," or if you are an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, mail the Court one copy of the letter.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Form 10. Bill of Costs

Instructions for this form: http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/forms/form10instructions.pdf

9th Cir. Case Number(s)

Case Name					
The Clerk is requested to award costs to (party name(s)):					
I swear under penalty of perjury that the copies for which costs are requested were actually and necessarily produced, and that the requested costs were actually expended.					
Signature _			Date		
(use "s/[typed name]" to sign electronically-filed documents)					
COST TAXAB	T TAXABLE REQUESTED (each column must be comp				leted)
DOCUMENTS	/ FEE PAID	No. of Copies	Pages per Copy	Cost per Page	TOTAL COST
Excerpts of Rec	ord*			\$	\$
	S) (Opening Brief; Answering d/or 3rd Brief on Cross-Appeal;			\$	\$
Reply Brief / Cı	ross-Appeal Reply Brief			\$	\$
Supplemental B	erief(s)			\$	\$
Petition for Review Docket Fee / Petition for Writ of Mandamus Docket Fee					\$
TOTAL:					\$
*Example: Calculate 4 copies of 3 volumes of excerpts of record that total 500 pages [Vol. 1 (10 pgs.) +					

Vol. 2 (250 pgs.) + Vol. 3 (240 pgs.)] as:

No. of Copies: 4; Pages per Copy: 500; Cost per Page: \$.10 (or actual cost IF less than \$.10); $TOTAL: 4 \times 500 \times \$.10 = \$200$.

Feedback or questions about this form? Email us at forms@ca9.uscourts.gov

Form 10 Rev. 12/01/2018