

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 5 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

KISASI DAVID LIGGINS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

ERIC ARNOLD, Acting Warden; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 17-15151

D.C. No. 2:16-cv-00257-JAM-CKD

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
John A. Mendez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 26, 2017\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Kisasi David Liggins, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447

---

\* 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).

(9th Cir. 2000). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Liggins’s due process claim because Liggins failed to allege facts sufficient to show a protected liberty interest. *See Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472, 483-85 (1995) (a prisoner has no federal or state protected liberty interest when the sanction imposed neither extends the length of his sentence nor imposes an “atypical and significant hardship on the inmate in relation to the ordinary incidents of prison life”); *Serrano v. Francis*, 345 F.3d 1071, 1077-78 (9th Cir. 2003) (due process procedural protections “adhere only when the disciplinary action implicates a protected liberty interest”).

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

**AFFIRMED.**