

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 30 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

PAUL ADAMS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AND
REHABILITATION, J. Beard, Secretary, in
his/her individual and official capacity; et
al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-56224

D.C. No. 5:15-cv-01067-SJO-PJW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
S. James Otero, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 15, 2017**

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

Paul Adams, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action following an order

* 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).

revoking his in forma pauperis (“IFP”) status. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). *Andrews v. King*, 398 F.3d 1113, 1118 n.6 (9th Cir. 2005). We affirm.

The district court properly revoked Adams’s IFP status because at the time Adams filed the complaint, he had filed three actions that qualified as “strikes,” and he did not plausibly allege that he was “under imminent danger of serious physical injury” at the time he lodged the complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g); *Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493 F.3d 1047, 1053 (9th Cir. 2007) (discussing the imminent danger exception to § 1915(g)).

We reject as unsupported by the record Adams’s contention that he is entitled to default judgment.

We reject as without merit Adams’s contentions concerning fraud, leave to amend, and judicial bias.

AFFIRMED.