

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 26 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JOHN MANUEL RUIZ,

No. 23-15514

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:16-cv-00931-APG-VCF

v.

MEMORANDUM*

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS; GEADENY, Doctor;
MASHA JOHNS, Doctor; VANHORN,
Medical Provider; DAVID DOMAR, A.P.N.;
ROBERT LEGRAND, Warden, Warden;
TARA CARPENTER, Associate Warden;
SANDIE, Associate Warden; CHAPMAN,
Correctional Officer; JOSEPH P WALLS;
GEDNEY; RICHARD LONG; MARSHA
JOHNS; WULFF; WANG; GALEN KAM,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada

Andrew P. Gordon, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 25, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, N.R. SMITH, and DE ALBA, Circuit Judges.

* 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).

Nevada state prisoner John Manuel Ruiz appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment for failure to exhaust in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Williams v. Paramo*, 775 F.3d 1182, 1191 (9th Cir. 2015). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Ruiz failed to submit a grievance relating to defendants' actions prior to his surgery and thus failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. *See Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 85 (2006) (explaining that an inmate must exhaust all available remedies before bringing suit); *Griffin v. Arpaio*, 557 F.3d 1117, 1121 (9th Cir. 2009) (explaining that a grievance must "provide enough information . . . to allow prison officials to take appropriate responsive measures" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying as moot Ruiz's motions to supplement the record at summary judgment. *See Tritchler v. County of Lake*, 358 F.3d 1150, 1155 (9th Cir. 2004) (setting forth standard of review for a district court's evidentiary rulings and stating that an appellant is required to establish prejudicial error).

We do not consider arguments or allegations raised for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

The motion (Docket Entry No. 31) to submit copies of grievances and the motion (Docket Entry No. 61) for service of the reply brief are denied as unnecessary. All other pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.