

MAR 20 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARIO A. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ALVARO C. TRAQUINA; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 14-16188

D.C. No. 2:11-cv-01687-LKK-AC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Lawrence K. Karlton, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 10, 2015\*\*

Before: FARRIS, WARDLAW, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Mario A. Williams, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging an Eighth Amendment violation in connection with the treatment of his right hand. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *Toguchi v.*

---

\* 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).

*Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1056 (9th Cir. 2004), and we affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment for defendants because Williams failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether defendants knew of and consciously disregarded a substantial risk to his health. *See id.* at 1057 (prison officials act with deliberate indifference only if they know of and disregard a “substantial risk of serious harm” to prisoner); *see also Starr v. Baca*, 652 F.3d 1202, 1207-08 (9th Cir. 2011) (requirements for establishing supervisory liability); *Cafasso, U.S. ex rel. v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., Inc.*, 637 F.3d 1047, 1061 (9th Cir. 2011) (“To survive summary judgment, a plaintiff must set forth non-speculative evidence of specific facts, not sweeping conclusory allegations.”).

**AFFIRMED.**