

JAN 10 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>REGINALD BELL, Sr.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>CITY OF FIFE, a political subdivision and Mayor, John Doe and Jane Doe, husband and wife and the marital community composed thereof, being sued in his official capacity; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 11-35094

D.C. No. 3:10-cv-05612-BHS

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Washington  
Benjamin H. Settle, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 19, 2011\*\*

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

Reginald Bell, Sr., appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing without prejudice his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that defendants

---

\* 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).

violated his constitutional rights. Although the district court’s order dismissed the “complaint” rather than the “action,” we interpret it as dismissing the action because the order adopts the report and recommendation in which the magistrate judge determines that further amendment of the complaint would be futile and recommends that the action be dismissed without prejudice. *In re Ford Motor Co./Citibank (South Dakota), N.A.*, 264 F.3d 952, 957 (9th Cir. 2001). We therefore have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A and 1915(e)(2). *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000); *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Bell’s action because Bell alleged only conclusory allegations of wrongdoing in his amended complaint and failed to attribute specific wrongful conduct to any individual defendant. *See Johnson v. Lucent Techs. Inc.*, 653 F.3d 1000, 1010-11 (9th Cir. 2011) (a civil complaint “must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face’” (citation omitted)).

Bell’s remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

**AFFIRMED.**