

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 31 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MICHAEL WILSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROL STOWERS, Peace Officer,  
individual; Peace Officer, official capacity;  
et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-1789

D.C. No.

2:21-cv-06306-DOC-DFM

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
David O. Carter, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 25, 2026\*\*

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

California state prisoner Michael Wilson appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging retaliation in violation of the First Amendment. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

---

\* 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).

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

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Wilson failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether defendant Stowers acted with a retaliatory motive in filing a rules violation report against Wilson. *See id.* at 1269 (setting forth elements of a First Amendment retaliation claim in the prison context); *see also Wood v. Yordy*, 753 F.3d 899, 905 (9th Cir. 2014) (explaining that “mere speculation that defendants acted out of retaliation is not sufficient” and that specific evidence of a causal connection between the protected conduct and adverse action is required).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Wilson’s motions for appointment of counsel because Wilson did not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. *See Agyeman v. Corr. Corp. of Am.*, 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004) (setting forth standard of review and “exceptional circumstances” requirement).

All pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**