

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 8 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RONALD NORDSTROM,

No. 16-55901

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:15-cv-07607-DMG-  
FFM

v.

GEOFF DEAN, Ventura County Sheriff,

MEMORANDUM\*

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Dolly M. Gee, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 23, 2017\*\*

Before: McKEOWN, WATFORD, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges

Ronald Nordstrom appeals from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging a violation of his Second Amendment rights. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). *Mashiri v. Epsten Grinnell & Howell*, 845 F.3d 984, 988

---

\* 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).

(9th Cir. 2017). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Nordstrom’s Second Amendment claim because “the Second Amendment does not protect, in any degree, the carrying of concealed firearms by members of the general public.” *Peruta v. County of San Diego*, 824 F.3d 919, 942 (9th Cir. 2016) (en banc).

**AFFIRMED.**