

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 24 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

WILLIAM LEE BELL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

COUNTY OF MARICOPA; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 20-16600

D.C. No. 2:19-cv-04809-MTL-JFM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona

Michael T. Liburdi, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 16, 2022**

Before: SILVERMAN, MILLER, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Arizona state prisoner William Lee Bell appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging an access-to-courts claim. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir.

* 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).

2000). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Bell's action because Bell failed to allege facts sufficient to demonstrate that he suffered an actual injury. *See Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 349-53 (1996) (elements of an access-to-courts claim and actual injury requirement); *see also Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (although pro se pleadings are construed liberally, a plaintiff must present factual allegations sufficient to state a plausible claim for relief).

AFFIRMED.