

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAR 18 2014

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

CHADERICK A. INGRAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 12-17333

D.C. No. 2:12-cv-01557-GEB-
GGH

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Garland E. Burrell, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 10, 2014**

Before: PREGERSON, LEAVY, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Chaderick A. Ingram appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging various claims against municipal, judicial, and private entities, among others, related to insurance and other transactions. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a

* 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).

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

The district court properly dismissed without prejudice Ingram'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639, 640-41 (9th Cir. 1989) (a complaint may be dismissed as frivolous if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact), *superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Ingram's motion for appointment of counsel because, notwithstanding his mental impairments, Ingram failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. *See Palmer v. Valdez*, 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009) (setting forth standard of review and explaining grounds that warrant appointment of counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)).

AFFIRMED.