

FILED

MAR 02 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RONNELL RAY HILL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

F. FOULK,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 14-15985

D.C. No. 2:14-cv-00329-CKD

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Carolyn K. Delaney, Magistrate Judge, Presiding\*\*

Submitted February 17, 2015\*\*\*

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, LEAVY, and FERNANDEZ, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Ronnell Ray Hill appeals pro se from the district

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* Hill consented to proceed before a magistrate judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

\*\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that defendant failed to protect him from an inmate assault. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. *Hamilton v. Brown*, 630 F.3d 889, 892 (9th Cir. 2011). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Hill's action because Hill failed to allege sufficient facts demonstrating that defendant knew of and disregarded a substantial risk of an inmate assault. *See Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994) (“[A] prison official cannot be found liable under the Eighth Amendment . . . unless the official knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate . . . safety[.]”); *see also Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (although pro se pleadings are to be liberally construed, a plaintiff must present factual allegations sufficient to state a plausible claim for relief).

**AFFIRMED.**