

JUN 08 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>BRIAN LYLE ANDERSON,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>GREG FIZER; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>
---

No. 10-16547

D.C. No. 2:09-cv-00609-JWS

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
John W. Sedwick, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 24, 2011\*\*

Before: PREGERSON, THOMAS, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Brian Lyle Anderson, an Arizona state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for failure to exhaust administrative remedies under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo the

---

\* 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).

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). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Anderson's action because he failed to exhaust administrative remedies prior to filing suit. *See Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 85, 93-95 (2006) ("proper exhaustion" is mandatory and requires adherence to administrative procedural rules); *McKinney v. Carey*, 311 F.3d 1198, 1199 (9th Cir. 2002) (per curiam) (requiring exhaustion of administrative remedies prior to filing suit).

We do not consider facts presented for the first time on appeal. *See United States v. Elias*, 921 F.2d 870, 874 (9th Cir. 1990) ("Documents or facts not presented to the district court are not part of the record on appeal.").

Anderson's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

**AFFIRMED.**