

JUN 30 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>SALVADOR SOLIS,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>DANIEL PARAMO, Warden; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>
---

No. 13-56256

D.C. No. 3:12-cv-01888-DMS-WVG

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of California  
Dana M. Sabraw, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 25, 2014\*\*

Before: HAWKINS, TALLMAN, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Salvador Solis appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. §1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000)

---

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

The district court properly dismissed Solis's action because Solis failed to allege facts sufficient to show that defendants acted with deliberate indifference to his pain following knee surgery. *See Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1057-58, 1060 (9th Cir. 2004) (deliberate indifference is a high legal standard, and is met only if the defendant knows of and disregards an excessive risk to the inmate's health; a mere difference in opinion concerning the course of treatment is insufficient).

**AFFIRMED.**