

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 21 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MICHAEL B. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

ARCELIA CASTANEDA, Psychiatric  
Technician,

Defendant-Appellee.

No. 16-17263

D.C. No. 1:16-cv-00908-MJS

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Michael J. Seng, Magistrate Judge, Presiding\*\*

Submitted March 8, 2017\*\*\*

Before: LEAVY, W. FLETCHER, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Michael B. Williams, a pre-trial civil detainee under California's Sexually Violent Predators Act, appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional violations. We have

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* Williams 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).

jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(ii), *Huftile v. Miccio-Fonseca*, 410 F.3d 1136, 1138 (9th Cir. 2005), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Williams's action because Williams failed to allege facts sufficient to state any plausible claim. *See Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (although pro se pleadings are liberally construed, a plaintiff must allege facts sufficient to state a plausible claim); *Rhodes v. Robinson*, 408 F.3d 559, 567-68 (9th Cir. 2005) (elements of retaliation claim in prison context); *Portman v. County of Santa Clara*, 995 F.2d 898 (9th Cir. 1993) (elements of procedural due process claim).

We reject as without merit Williams's contentions that he was held to a higher pleading standard.

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

**AFFIRMED.**