

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 30 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

WILLIAM JAMES,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-15287

D.C. No. 2:10-cv-00664-MCE-AC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Morrison C. England, Jr., Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 24, 2017\*\*

Before: THOMAS, Chief Judge, and SILVERMAN and RAWLINSON,  
Circuit Judges.

William James appeals pro se from the district court's order sua sponte dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for failure to comply with the district court's order. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion, *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 2002), and

---

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

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

we affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing James' action after James failed to comply with court orders and meet deadlines. *See id.* at 642-43 (setting forth the factors to consider before dismissing for failure to comply with a court order).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying James' motion for appointment of counsel because James failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. *See Cano v. Taylor*, 739 F.3d 1214, 1218 (9th Cir. 2014) (setting forth standard of review and requirements for appointment of counsel).

**AFFIRMED.**