

AUG 16 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>NEIL B. STAFFORD,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>STEVEN POWERS; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>

No. 10-35356

D.C. No. 1:09-cv-03031-CL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
Mark D. Clarke, Magistrate Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 11, 2011 **

Before: THOMAS, SILVERMAN, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Neil B. Stafford appeals pro se from the district court’s grant of summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging various constitutional claims concerning his designation as a predatory sex offender and conditions of parole.

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Olsen v. Idaho*

* 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).

State Bd. of Med., 363 F.3d 916, 922 (9th Cir. 2004) (summary judgment); *Brown v. Cal. Dep't of Corr.*, 554 F.3d 747, 749 (9th Cir. 2009) (absolute immunity). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment on Stafford's claims regarding Defendants' imposition of parole conditions. *See Anderson v. Boyd*, 714 F.2d 906, 909 (9th Cir. 1983) (parole officers entitled to absolute immunity for imposition of parole conditions).

The district court properly granted summary judgment on the ground that Defendants are entitled to absolute immunity with respect to their decision to designate Stafford a predatory sex offender without holding an evidentiary hearing. *See Brown v. Cal. Dep't of Corr.*, 554 F.3d 747, 751 (9th Cir. 2009) (parole board officials entitled to absolute immunity for actions taken in processing parole applications); *Swift v. Cal.*, 384 F.3d 1184, 1190-91 (9th Cir. 2004) (parole officials entitled to absolute immunity for adjudicating parole decisions).

We do not consider claims not adequately raised in Stafford's opening brief. *See Entm't Research Grp., Inc. v. Genesis Creative Grp., Inc.*, 122 F.3d 1211, 1217 (9th Cir. 1997).

We deny Stafford's motion to supplement the record.

AFFIRMED.