

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 18 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MELINDA GABRIELLA VALENZUELA,

No. 16-16492

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:15-cv-00020-NVW

v.

MEMORANDUM*

ARLENE McKAMEY, Nurse Practitioner;
ELIZA HOMER, Assistant Facility Health
Administrator at Corizon - Eyman,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Neil V. Wake, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 11, 2017**

Before: CANBY, KOZINSKI, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Arizona state prisoner Melinda Gabriella Valenzuela appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to her serious medical needs. We have jurisdiction under

* 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).

28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Colwell v. Bannister*, 763 F.3d 1060, 1065 (9th Cir. 2014). We affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Valenzuela failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether Homer and McKamey were deliberately indifferent to Valenzuela’s bladder condition. *See id.* at 1066-68 (an official is “deliberately indifferent” if she “knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health and safety”; a difference of opinion between a physician and the prisoner concerning what medical care is appropriate does not amount to deliberate indifference (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Valenzuela’s motions to supplement the record (Docket Entry Nos. 5, 10, 20) are granted. However, to the extent that the documents have not been filed in the district court, we do not consider them. *See United States v. Elias*, 921 F.2d 870, 874 (9th Cir. 1990) (“Documents or facts not presented to the district court are not part of the record on appeal.”).

AFFIRMED.