

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 14 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CHRISTOPHER JAMES HENSON,

No. 20-15117

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:19-cv-04396-MTL-  
DMF

v.

CORIZON HEALTH, INC.; et al.,

MEMORANDUM\*

Defendants-Appellees,

and

STEWART, Unknown; et al.,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
Michael T. Liburdi, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 6, 2020\*\*

Before: BERZON, N.R. SMITH, and MILLER, 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).

Arizona state prisoner Christopher James Henson appeals pro se from the district court's orders denying his motions for a preliminary injunction and his motion for reconsideration of the denial of a preliminary injunction in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional violations. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We review for an abuse of discretion. *Jackson v. City & County of San Francisco*, 746 F.3d 953, 958 (9th Cir. 2014) (denial of preliminary injunction); *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993) (denial of reconsideration). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Henson's motions for a preliminary injunction because Henson failed to demonstrate that such relief is warranted. *See Jackson*, 746 F.3d at 958 (plaintiff seeking preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the balance of equities tips in his favor, and an injunction is in the public interest).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Henson's motion for reconsideration because Henson failed to demonstrate any basis for such relief. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J*, 5 F.3d at 1263 (grounds for relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e)).

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

**AFFIRMED.**