

JAN 02 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>CARL LEE CALLEGARI,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>CHARLES D. LEE, M.D.; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 11-17945

D.C. No. 3:08-cv-02420-MMC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Maxine M. Chesney, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 19, 2012\*\*

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

California state prisoner Carl Lee Callegari appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that prison officials were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs by failing to

---

\* 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).

provide him with adequate treatment for hepatitis. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1056 (9th Cir. 2004), and we affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Callegari failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether defendants were deliberately indifferent in their treatment of his hepatitis. *See id.* at 1058 (prison officials act with deliberate indifference only if they know of and disregard an excessive risk to inmate health, and a difference of opinion concerning the appropriate course of treatment does not amount to deliberate indifference).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Callegari's motion to compel discovery. *See Hallett v. Morgan*, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir. 2002) (setting forth standard of review and describing trial court's broad discretion to deny discovery).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by entertaining defendants' successive motion for summary judgment. *See Hoffman v. Tonnemacher*, 593 F.3d 908, 911-12 (9th Cir. 2010) (setting forth standard of review and describing trial court's broad discretion to permit successive motions for summary judgment).

**AFFIRMED.**