

FEB 25 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MICHAEL CURTIS REYNOLDS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LINDA MCGREW; et al.,

Respondents - Appellees.

Nos. 14-55090
14-55292

D.C. Nos. 2:13-cv-03591-MWF
2:13-cv-07798-MWF

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Michael W. Fitzgerald, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 17, 2015**

Before: O’SCANNLAIN, LEAVY, and FERNANDEZ, Circuit Judges.

In these consolidated appeals, federal prisoner Michael Curtis Reynolds
appeals pro se from the district court’s judgments dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2241

* 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).

habeas corpus petitions. We review the dismissal of a section 2241 petition de novo, *see Alaimalo v. United States*, 645 F.3d 1042, 1047 (9th Cir. 2011), and we affirm.

In Appeal No. 14-55090, Reynolds challenges the loss of good time credits following a disciplinary hearing. In Appeal No. 14-55292, Reynolds contends that the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”) improperly classified him as a high-security-risk inmate and improperly housed him in a high-security facility. The district court did not err by dismissing either of Reynolds’s petitions for failure to exhaust the administrative remedies available to him. *See Ward v. Chavez*, 678 F.3d 1042, 1045 (9th Cir. 2012). Although Reynolds attempted to appeal the BOP’s decisions, the record shows that the BOP rejected his appeals because they did not meet BOP requirements. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 542.17 (2012). We are also unpersuaded by Reynolds’s argument that the documents submitted to the district court by respondents were fraudulent or false.

We reject as meritless Reynolds’s challenges to the district court’s handling of his petitions.

Reynolds's request for an emergency temporary restraining order is denied.

AFFIRMED.