

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 19 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RANDY CARL EILAND,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TAD MENDEZ, Discipline Hearing Officer
at Saguaro Correctional Center; A.
MORROW, Discipline Hearing Officer at
Saguaro Correctional Center,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-3920

D.C. No. 2:24-cv-00781-MTL--
ESW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Michael T. Liburdi, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 16, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, NGUYEN, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Idaho state prisoner Randy Carl Eiland, who is housed in a private prison in Arizona, appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C.

* 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).

§ 1983 action alleging due process violations arising from two separate disciplinary proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. *Wilhelm v. Rotman*, 680 F.3d 1113, 1118 (9th Cir. 2012). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Eiland's action because Eiland failed to allege facts sufficient to state any plausible claim. *See Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (although pro se pleadings are construed liberally, a plaintiff must allege facts sufficient to state a plausible claim).

We do not consider documents and facts not presented to the district court. *See United States v. Elias*, 921 F.2d 870, 874 (9th Cir. 1990).

AFFIRMED.