

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 20 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MAURICE HUNT,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

ANDRE MATEVOUSIAN; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 17-15504

D.C. No. 1:15-cv-01457-DAD-SAB

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Dale A. Drozd, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 15, 2017\*\*

Before: CANBY, TROTT, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Federal prisoner Maurice Hunt appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his action brought under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), alleging deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.

---

\* 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).

§ 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Hunt’s action because Hunt failed to allege facts sufficient to show that defendants were deliberately indifferent to his back and hip injury. *See Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1057, 1060 (9th Cir. 2004) (a prison official is deliberately indifferent only if he or she knows of and disregards an excessive risk to an inmate’s health; mere negligence is insufficient to establish deliberate indifference); *see also Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 847 (1994) (Eighth Amendment claim for denial of humane conditions of confinement requires showing that prison official “knows that inmates face a substantial risk of serious harm and disregards that risk by failing to take reasonable measures to abate it.”).

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

**AFFIRMED.**