

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 27 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JOJO EJONGA-DEOGRACIAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STEPHEN SINCLAIR, Secretary,
Department of Corrections; MICHAEL
OBENLAND, Superintendent, Monroe
Correctional Complex; WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS; ROY GONZALEZ,
Headquarters Correctional Manager,
Department of Corrections; SCOTT
RUSSELL, Assistant Secretary/Deputy
Director, Department of
Corrections; CARLA SCHETTLER,
Superintendent/Associate Superintendent,
Washington State Penitentiary; LEE
STEMLER, CS2 Grievance Coordinator,
Monroe Correctional Complex; DAVID
HEISE, Construction/Maintenance Project
Supervisor, Monroe Correctional Complex,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-1359

D.C. No. 2:20-cv-00320-RSM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Ricardo S. Martinez, District Judge, Presiding

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

Submitted June 18, 2025**

Before: CANBY, S.R. THOMAS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Washington state prisoner JoJo Ejonga-Deogracias appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging a First Amendment claim related to receiving photographs in the mail. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Furnace v. Sullivan*, 705 F.3d 1021, 1026 (9th Cir. 2013). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment on the basis of qualified immunity because defendants' conduct did not violate clearly established constitutional rights. *See Sorrels v. McKee*, 290 F.3d 965, 971 (9th Cir. 2002) (concluding qualified immunity proper when there was no binding precedent and when "the policy's illegality was not so obvious that any prison official involved in enforcing it should have known he was breaking the law").

Ejonga's request for counsel, set forth in his opening brief, is denied.

AFFIRMED.

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