

MAY 22 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>DONALD WILLIAMS,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>M. S. EVANS, Warden; et al.,</p> <p>Defendants - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 11-15384

D.C. No. 2:09-cv-03067-GGH

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Gregory G. Hollows, Magistrate Judge, Presiding**

Submitted May 15, 2012***

Before: CANBY, GRABER, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Donald Williams, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that prison

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The parties consented to proceed before a magistrate judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

*** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

officials violated the Eighth Amendment by failing to provide him with safe showering facilities. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1056 (9th Cir. 2004), and we affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Williams failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether defendants acted with deliberate indifference regarding shower safety and the provision of shower mats. *See id.* at 1058 (prison officials act with deliberate indifference only if they know of and disregard an excessive risk to inmate health and safety); *id.* at 1060 (“Deliberate indifference is a high legal standard.”).

Williams’ remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

AFFIRMED.