NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

JUN 26 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

WILLIAM H. CHISM III, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. CHANG, Correctional Counselor I; DE LA ROSA, Sergeant; CROSS, Correctional Officer; DOMINGO, Correctional Officer, Defendants - Appellees.	No. 24-6258 D.C. No. 2:20-cv-01072-DJC-DMC MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Daniel J. Calabretta, District Court, Presiding

Submitted June 22, 2026**

Before: CANBY, BENNETT, and BADE, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner William H. Chism, III appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging First Amendment retaliation claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We

---

* 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).

review de novo. *Brodheim v. Cry*, 584 F.3d 1262, 1267 (9th Cir. 2009). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Chism failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether Chang or De La Rosa took adverse actions against him or as to whether Cross and Domingo's actions were not taken in furtherance of legitimate penological goals. *See Rhodes v. Robinson*, 408 F.3d 559, 567-68 (9th Cir. 2005) (setting forth the elements of a First Amendment retaliation claim in the prison context).

AFFIRMED.