

OCT 07 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>RONALD ADAMS,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>P. L. VAZQUEZ and C. GIPSON,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>

No. 09-16230

D.C. No. 1:05-cv-00671-OWW-WMW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Oliver W. Wanger, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 13, 2010**

Before: SILVERMAN, CALLAHAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Ronald Adams, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to his medical needs. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

* 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).

We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), *Huftile v. Miccio-Fonseca*, 410 F.3d 1136, 1138 (9th Cir. 2005), and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000), and may affirm on any ground supported by the record, *O'Guinn v. Lovelock Corr. Ctr.*, 502 F.3d 1056, 1059 (9th Cir. 2007). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Adams's deliberate indifference claims because Adams alleges, at most, differences of opinion between himself and the prison health care staff, and among the prisons' health care staff, about the appropriate course of treatment. *See Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1058 (9th Cir. 2004) (differences of opinion are insufficient to establish deliberate indifference).

The district court properly dismissed Adams's due process claim based on defendants' allegedly improper processing and disposition of his grievances because he has no due process right to the handling of grievances in any particular manner. *See Mann v. Adams*, 855 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1988) (order).

AFFIRMED.