

JAN 11 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MARCUS L. HUDSON,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>B. TRANGO, Correctional Officer; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>
---

No. 09-15510

D.C. No. 2:08-CV-01589-RLH-VPC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Roger L. Hunt, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 15, 2009\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Marcus L. Hudson, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for failure to

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

exhaust administrative remedies pursuant to the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo the district court's dismissal for failure to exhaust, and for clear error its factual determinations, *Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315 F.3d 1108, 1117 (9th Cir. 2003), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Hudson's claims because he did not complete the administrative appeals process in accordance with the administrative procedural rules, and failed to demonstrate that he was obstructed from doing so. *See Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 90-91 (2006) (explaining that "proper exhaustion" under § 1997e(a) requires inmates to complete "all steps that the agency holds out" and to follow administrative procedural rules).

Hudson's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

**AFFIRMED.**