## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**FILED** 

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 19 2018

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

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

LEON EUGENE MORRIS,

No. 15-15686

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:10-cv-02069-TLN-DAD

V.

MEMORANDUM\*

K. TURNER; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California Troy L. Nunley, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 16, 2018\*\*

Before: REINHARDT, TROTT, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Leon Eugene Morris appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Williams v. Paramo*, 775 F.3d 1182, 1191 (9th Cir. 2015). We affirm.

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

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

The district court properly granted summary judgment because Morris did not exhaust administrative remedies and failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether administrative remedies were effectively unavailable to him. *See Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 90 (2006) (a prisoner must properly exhaust "which means using all steps that the agency holds out, and doing so properly (so that the agency addresses the issues on the merits)" (emphasis, citation, and internal quotation marks omitted)); *Sapp v. Kimbrell*, 623 F.3d 813, 823-24, 826-27 (9th Cir. 2010) (describing limited circumstances under which exhaustion may be effectively unavailable).

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

Morris's motion for leave to file a late reply brief (Docket Entry No. 40) is granted. The Clerk shall file the reply brief submitted at Docket Entry No. 41.

## AFFIRMED.

2 15-15686