

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 21 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

DAINE ANTON CRAWLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CLARK COUNTY DETENTION CENTER; NAPHCARE, INC., medical company at CCDC; WELLPATH LLC, medical company now at CCDC; NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, High Desert State Prison Medical; LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT; COUNTY OF CLARK, corporation; B WOLDEN, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Officer; JOE LOMBARDO, Sheriff Las Vegas Metropolitan Police; MELODY MERALONA, Naphcare Provider; RICHARD NEWMAN, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Sgt; DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, DIVISION OF PAROLE AND PROBATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 23-2197

D.C. No. 2:19-cv-02179-CDS-BNW

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Nevada  
Cristina D. Silva, District Judge, Presiding

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

Submitted March 17, 2025\*\*

Before: CANBY, R. NELSON, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Daine Anton Crawley appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging excessive force during his pretrial detention. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo the district court's ruling on cross-motions for summary judgment. *Hamby v. Hammond*, 821 F.3d 1085, 1090 (9th Cir. 2016). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment for defendant Wolden on Crawley's excessive force claim because Crawley failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether Wolden personally participated in the alleged excessive force in March 2018. *See Jones v. Williams*, 297 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 2002) (explaining that liability under § 1983 requires personal participation by the defendant in the alleged rights deprivation).

Crawley's requests for appointment of counsel, set forth at Docket Entry No. 25 and in the opening and reply briefs, are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**

---

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2)*.