

JUN 20 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>DAVID GENE LANCASTER,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>AUNG, Dr.; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>

No. 12-16109

D.C. No. 3:09-cv-03230-MMC

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 18, 2013**

Before: TALLMAN, M. SMITH, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner David Gene Lancaster appeals pro se from the district court’s summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. 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, *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1056 (9th Cir. 2004), and we affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Lancaster failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether defendants were deliberately indifferent in their treatment of his Valley Fever-related meningitis. *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 Lancaster'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).

Lancaster's argument regarding defendants' failure to produce documents in response to his discovery requests is unpersuasive.

AFFIRMED.