

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 27 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

AMAR SAFADI,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COUNTY OF SNOHOMISH;
SNOHOMISH COUNTY OFFICE OF THE
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY;
SNOHOMISH COUNTY SHERIFF'S
DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-2550

D.C. No.

2:23-cv-00887-RAJ

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Richard A. Jones, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 21, 2025**

Before: SILVERMAN, LEE, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Amar Safadi appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging retaliation, excessive force, and improper

* 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).

hiring by Snohomish County after he was arrested, prosecuted, and incarcerated several times. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Colwell v. Bannister*, 763 F.3d 1060, 1065 (9th Cir. 2014). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Safadi failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether defendants have a pattern, practice, or policy that caused any deprivation of his federal rights. *See Williams v. City of Sparks*, 112 F.4th 635, 646 (9th Cir. 2024) (explaining requirements for municipal liability under *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)).

We reject as unsupported by the record Safadi's contentions that the district court applied an incorrect legal standard or failed to examine his evidence.

AFFIRMED.