

MAR 02 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ALEX LOMOTA MARTI,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

B. WARREN,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 14-16428

D.C. No. 4:14-cv-02305-YGR

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 17, 2015\*\*

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

California state prisoner Alex Lomota Marti appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that defendant retaliated against him for filing grievances in violation of the First Amendment.

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal

---

\* 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. § 1915A. *Hamilton v. Brown*, 630 F.3d 889, 892 (9th Cir. 2011). We may affirm on any basis supported by the record. *Hartmann v. Cal. Dep't of Corr. & Rehab.*, 707 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2013). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Marti's complaint because Marti failed to allege sufficient facts to show that defendant's warning did not reasonably advance a legitimate penological goal. *See Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (although pro se pleadings are to be liberally construed, a plaintiff must still present factual allegations sufficient to state a plausible claim for relief); *Rhodes v. Robinson*, 408 F.3d 559, 567-68 (9th Cir. 2005) (elements of retaliation claim in the prison context).

Denial of leave to amend was not an abuse of discretion because amendment would have been futile. *See McQuillion v. Schwarzenegger*, 369 F.3d 1091, 1099 (9th Cir. 2004).

**AFFIRMED.**