

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

AUG 20 2014

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

AMAZING STEWART,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

L. BROWN; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 13-15178

D.C. No. 1:10-cv-01093-LJO-JLT

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Lawrence J. O'Neill, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 13, 2014\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, THOMAS, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Amazing Stewart appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing for failure to exhaust administrative remedies his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging a failure-to-protect claim. We have jurisdiction

---

\* 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).

under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *Sapp v. Kimbrell*, 623 F.3d 813, 821 (9th Cir. 2010), and we affirm.

The district court properly concluded that Stewart failed to exhaust his administrative remedies because Stewart did not notify prison officials as to the nature of the wrong underlying his failure-to-protect claim in a timely manner. *See id.* at 818, 821-24 (describing standard for proper exhaustion and explaining that an inmate's grievance must comply with time limits and provide enough information to alert prison officials to the nature of the wrong for which redress is sought); *Griffin v. Arpaio*, 557 F.3d 1117, 1120-21 (9th Cir. 2009) (grievance must give sufficient notice of claim).

**AFFIRMED.**