

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 15 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

THOMAS J. COFFELT,

No. 16-36078

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 1:16-cv-00190-CWD

v.

MEMORANDUM*

KEITH YORDY, Warden; DAVIDSON,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Idaho
Candy W. Dale, Magistrate Judge, Presiding**

Submitted August 9, 2017***

Before: SCHROEDER, TASHIMA, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Idaho state prisoner Thomas J. Coffelt appeals pro se from the district court's judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional claims and claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"). We have

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

** Coffelt 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. § 1915A, *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000), and we affirm.

In his opening brief, Coffelt fails to address any of the grounds for dismissal and has therefore waived his challenge to the district court's order. *See Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Washington*, 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[W]e will not consider any claims that were not actually argued in appellant’s opening brief.”); *Acosta-Huerta v. Estelle*, 7 F.3d 139, 144 (9th Cir. 1993) (issues not supported by argument in pro se appellant’s opening brief are waived); *see also Greenwood v. FAA*, 28 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 1994) (“We will not manufacture arguments for an appellant, and a bare assertion does not preserve a claim . . .”).

We do not consider matters raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.