

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 18 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

PETER JAMES LITTLE, AKA Peter Little,
AKA Peter J. Little,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CHARLES L. RYAN, named as: Charles
Ryan, Director of A.D.C. at 1601 W.
Jefferson St. Phoenix, AZ 85007;
UNKNOWN RADECKI, Mr./ Director or
A.C.I. for A.D.C. at 1601 E. Jefferson St.,
Phoenix, AZ 85007,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 14-15690

D.C. No. 2:12-cv-02512-FJM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Frederick J. Martone, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 11, 2017**

Before: CANBY, KOZINSKI, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Arizona state prisoner Peter James Little appeals from the district court's

* 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).

judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional violations in connection with his prison employment. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

Little forfeited his opportunity to appeal the denial of his motions to amend because he did not file any objections to the magistrate judge's orders. *See Bastidas v. Chappell*, 791 F.3d 1155, 1159 (9th Cir. 2015) (“[A] party who fails to file timely objections to a magistrate judge’s nondispositive order with the district judge to whom the case is assigned forfeits its right to appellate review of that order.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)); *see also Anderson v. Woodcreek Venture Ltd.*, 351 F.3d 911, 917 (9th Cir. 2003) (motion for leave to amend a complaint is a nondispositive order).

Because we affirm, Little’s request to order reassignment to a different judge on remand, set forth in his replacement opening brief, is denied.

Little’s request to dismiss the portions of his appeal addressing entry of summary judgment (Docket Entry No. 60) is granted.

Little’s request for oral argument (Docket Entry No. 60) is denied.

AFFIRMED.