

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

MAR 20 2015

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

WILLIAM TERRY SMITH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHN HAUGEN; MARC OKULEY,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 13-35449

D.C. No. 3:12-cv-00249-RRB

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Alaska  
Ralph R. Beistline, Chief District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 14, 2014\*\*

Before: HUG, FARRIS, and CANBY, Circuit Judges.

William Terry Smith appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for reconsideration following the dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action as barred by the statute of limitations. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

---

\* 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).

We review the district court's denial of the motion for reconsideration for abuse of discretion. *Benson v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.*, 673 F.3d 1207, 1211 (9th Cir. 2012). We review the underlying law de novo to determine whether the district court abused its discretion by relying on an inaccurate view of the law. *Id.*

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Smith's motion for reconsideration because he failed to establish grounds for such relief. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (setting forth grounds for reconsideration under Fed.R.Civ.P. 60(b)).

We do not address issues that were neither raised in Smith's motion for reconsideration nor addressed in the district court's order denying that motion. *See Hillis v. Heineman*, 626 F.3d 1014, 1019 (9th Cir. 2010).

**AFFIRMED.**