

OCT 16 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RICKARD DENNIS ANDERSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHRISTINE SY, Director; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 11-17232

D.C. No. 3:11-cv-03184-SI

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Susan Illston, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 9, 2012\*\*

Before: RAWLINSON, MURGUIA, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Rickard Dennis Anderson appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action as frivolous. We have jurisdiction under 28

---

\* 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).

U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Anderson's action as frivolous because the complaint contains indecipherable facts and unsupported legal assertions. *See Jackson v. Arizona*, 885 F.2d 639, 640-41 (9th Cir. 1989) (a complaint may be dismissed as frivolous if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact), *superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000); *see also Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1261 (9th Cir. 1992) (the district court's discretion to deny leave to amend is particularly broad where it has afforded plaintiff one or more opportunities to amend).

**AFFIRMED.**