

JUL 07 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

AMADEO SANCHEZ,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA; NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Defendants,

and

MICHAEL B. KOEHN; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 12-17194

D.C. No. 3:11-cv-00273-LRH-
WGC

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada
Larry R. Hicks, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 25, 2014**

Before: HAWKINS, TALLMAN, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

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

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

Nevada state prisoner Amadeo Sanchez appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment 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 de novo, *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1056 (9th Cir. 2004), and we affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Sanchez failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether defendants knew that Sanchez faced a substantial risk of serious harm to his health arising from his Hepatitis C condition, and consciously disregarded such a risk. *See Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 835, 842 (1994) (a prison official acts with deliberate indifference only if “he knows that inmates face a substantial risk of serious harm and disregards that risk by failing to take reasonable measures to abate it”); *Toguchi*, 391 F.3d at 1058 (difference of opinion between a prisoner and medical authorities regarding the course of treatment does not constitute deliberate indifference; rather, the prisoner must establish that the chosen course of treatment “was medically unacceptable under the circumstances” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Sanchez's contentions regarding the district court's alleged failure to review his evidence and rely only on defendants' “fabricated” evidence, and defendants'

allegedly improper opposition to his motion to extend his prison “copy work account,” are unpersuasive.

AFFIRMED.