

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 26 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MATTHEW RYLEY CORZINE,

No. 17-16605

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:17-cv-00052-MMD-WGC

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

ADAM PAUL LAXALT; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Nevada  
Miranda M. Du, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 18, 2017\*\*

Before: WALLACE, SILVERMAN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Matthew Ryley Corzine appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for a preliminary injunction to enjoin the enforcement of residency requirements for sex offenders under Nevada law. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We review for an abuse of discretion. *Jackson v.*

---

\* 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).

*City & County of San Francisco*, 746 F.3d 953, 958 (9th Cir. 2014). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Corzine's request for preliminary injunctive relief seeking to enjoin the enforcement of statutory residency requirements because Corzine failed to establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits of his claim alleging that the imposition of lifetime supervision conditions violates the Ex Post Facto Clause. *See* U.S. CONST. ART. I, § 9, cl. 3; *Jackson*, 746 F.3d at 958 (plaintiff seeking preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the balance of equities tips in his favor, and an injunction is in the public interest).

We lack jurisdiction to review the dismissal of Corzine's claims because the district court's order did not dispose of the action as to all claims between the parties. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Prellwitz v. Sisto*, 657 F.3d 1035, 1038 (9th Cir. 2011) (appellate jurisdiction is limited to final orders disposing of all claims between parties).

Appellees' motion to supplement the record (Docket Entry No. 8) is denied as unnecessary.

**AFFIRMED.**