

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 24 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ANTHONY LOZANO SOLIS,

No. 20-17140

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:17-cv-02378-ROS-CDB

CHARLES L. RYAN, Director of Arizona
Department of Corrections; et al.,

MEMORANDUM*

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Roslyn O. Silver, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 15, 2022**

Before: SILVERMAN, WATFORD, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Arizona state prisoner Anthony Lozano Solis appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to his safety. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1056 (9th Cir. 2004). We affirm.

* 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).

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Solis failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether defendants were deliberately indifferent to his safety. *See Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994) (a prison official is deliberately indifferent only if he or she “knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety; the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he [or she] must also draw the inference”).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Solis’s motion to compel because the denial did not result in actual or substantial prejudice. *See Hallett v. Morgan*, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir. 2002) (setting forth standard of review and holding a district court’s “decision to deny discovery will not be disturbed except upon the clearest showing that denial of discovery results in actual and substantial prejudice to the complaining litigant”).

Solis’s motion for an in camera review of court logs, set forth in his reply brief, is denied as moot.

AFFIRMED.