

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

DEC 17 2014

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

LONNIE C. WILLIAMS,  
  
Plaintiff - Appellant,  
  
v.  
  
KIDILEY; MENDORO,  
  
Defendants - Appellees.

No. 13-57123

D.C. No. 5:12-cv-02272-AG-RNB

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Andrew J. Guilford, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 9, 2014\*\*

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Lonnie C. Williams, a California state prisoner, 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. *Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341 (9th Cir. 2010)

---

\* 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 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)); *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 Williams's action because the complaint and the exhibits attached thereto show that defendants did not act with deliberate indifference to Williams's medical needs. *See Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1057-58, 1060 (9th Cir. 2004) (deliberate indifference is a high legal standard; medical malpractice, negligence, or a difference of medical opinion, is not sufficient).

We do not consider Williams's contention, raised for the first time on appeal, that the district court acted outside its jurisdiction in considering Williams's allegations against Dr. Kidiley. *See Smith v. Marsh*, 194 F.3d 1045, 1052 (9th Cir. 1999).

**AFFIRMED.**