

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 21 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

WILLIAMS RODRIGUEZ,

No. 20-55929

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 5:18-cv-01168-DSF-RAO

v.

MEMORANDUM*

A. RODRIGUEZ, Correctional Lieutenant,
individual; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

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

Submitted October 12, 2021**

Before: TALLMAN, RAWLINSON, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Former California state prisoner Williams Rodriguez appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) motion for relief from judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We

* 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).

review for an abuse of discretion. *United States v. Asarco Inc.*, 430 F.3d 972, 978 (9th Cir. 2005). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Rodriguez's motion for relief from judgment under Rule 60(b)(6) because Rodriguez failed to establish extraordinary circumstances warranting relief. *See Lehman v. United States*, 154 F.3d 1010, 1017 (9th Cir. 1998) (requirements for obtaining relief under Rule 60(b)(6)).

We reject as meritless Rodriguez's contentions that the district court should have certified his U visa.

All pending motions (Docket Entry Nos. 25, 41, and 42) are denied.

AFFIRMED.