

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 15 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RYANT TRIMALE PRATT,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

J. SCHRAG; K. GISLER; R. BELL; C.  
PARRY; T. CAMPBELL; J. YOUNG; S.  
TAYMAN,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 21-17055

D.C. No. 4:21-cv-08217-JSW

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Jeffrey S. White, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 8, 2022\*\*

Before: WALLACE, TALLMAN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Ryant Trimale Pratt appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging due process claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo.

---

\* 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).

*Hamilton v. Brown*, 630 F.3d 889, 892 (9th Cir. 2011). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Pratt’s action because Pratt failed to allege facts sufficient to state a plausible due process claim. *See* Cal. Code Regs. tit. 15, § 3335; *Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472, 483-84 (1995) (a constitutionally protected liberty interest arises when a restraint imposes an “atypical and significant hardship on the inmate in relation to the ordinary incidents of prison life”).

**AFFIRMED.**