

MAR 07 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

KEITH L. NASH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RICK ROBINSON; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 10-36157

D.C. No. 3:09-cv-05178-RBL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Ronald B. Leighton, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 21, 2012**

Before: FERNANDEZ, McKEOWN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Keith L. Nash appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional violations in connection with his term of supervised released from the Washington Department of Corrections.

* 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 have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Ramirez v. City of Buena Park*, 560 F.3d 1012, 1019 (9th Cir. 2009). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Nash failed to present any evidence creating a genuine dispute of material fact as to any of his claims. *See Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986); *see also United States v. Kincade*, 379 F.3d 813, 833 (9th Cir. 2004) (en banc) (recognizing “well-established principle that parolees and other conditional releasees are not entitled to the full panoply of rights and protections possessed by the general public”).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by declining to continue defendants’ summary judgment motion until Nash could conduct discovery because Nash failed to identify the specific facts that discovery would have revealed or how those facts would have been essential to resist the summary judgment motion. *See California v. Campbell*, 138 F.3d 772, 779-80 (9th Cir. 1998) (reviewing for an abuse of discretion and setting forth relevant factors).

Nash’s remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

AFFIRMED.