

JAN 25 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

GREGORY TOMMIE JONES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FELIX IGBINOSA; JAMES YATES,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 10-17124

D.C. No. 1:08-cv-00163-LJO-SKO

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Lawrence J. O'Neill, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 17, 2012\*\*

Before: LEAVY, TALLMAN, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Gregory Tommie Jones appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to his health and safety. 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 the district court's dismissal for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A or 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). *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 Jones's action because Jones failed to allege any facts in his amended complaint sufficient to show that either defendant knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to his health or safety. *See Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994) (to state a claim for deliberate indifference, "the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference"); *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1060 (9th Cir. 2004) ("Deliberate indifference is a high legal standard.").

Jones's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

Jones's motions for judicial notice are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**