

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 4 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

DONALD WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

E. BAKER; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 17-15406

D.C. No. 2:15-cv-01155-MCE-CKD

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 26, 2017**

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Donald Williams, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment for failure to exhaust administrative remedies in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging Eighth Amendment claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Albino v. Baca*, 747 F.3d 1162,

* 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).

1171 (9th Cir. 2014). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Williams failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether he exhausted his administrative remedies before filing his lawsuit or whether administrative remedies were “effectively unavailable.” *See Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 90 (2006) (the Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”) requires “proper exhaustion,” which means “using all steps that the agency holds out, and doing so properly (so that the agency addresses the issues on the merits)” (emphasis, citation, and internal quotation marks omitted)); *Sapp v. Kimbrell*, 623 F.3d 813, 826 (9th Cir. 2010) (PLRA does not require exhaustion when remedies are “effectively unavailable”).

We reject as without merit Williams’s contention that the district court did not consider his supplemental objections to the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations.

AFFIRMED.