

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 22 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

STEVEN VLASICH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

C. NAREDDY, Dr.; O. BEREGOVSKAYA,
Dr.,

Defendants-Appellees,

and

C. MCCABE, Dr.; et al.,

Defendants.

No. 19-15630

D.C. No. 1:13-cv-00326-LJO-EPG

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Lawrence J. O'Neill, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 17, 2021**

Before: FERNANDEZ, BYBEE, and BADE, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Steven Vlasich appeals pro se from the district

* 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).

court's judgment following a jury verdict 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 for substantial evidence the sufficiency of the evidence to support a jury verdict. *Harper v. City of Los Angeles*, 533 F.3d 1010, 1021 (9th Cir. 2008). We affirm.

We sustain the jury verdict because it is supported by substantial evidence. *See id.* (“A jury’s verdict must be upheld if it is supported by substantial evidence, which is evidence adequate to support the jury’s conclusion, even if it is also possible to draw a contrary conclusion.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

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.