

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 20 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ALFRED KING,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

P. MEDINA; J. GUILLORY,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 17-17418

D.C. No. 2:16-cv-02709-JAM-CKD

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
John A. Mendez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 15, 2018**

Before: FARRIS, BYBEE, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Alfred King, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging a due process violation. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. *Byrd v. Maricopa Cty. Bd. of Supervisors*,

* 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).

845 F.3d 919, 922 (9th Cir. 2017). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed King’s action because King failed to allege facts sufficient to show that a meaningful post-deprivation remedy was unavailable to him. *See Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517, 533 (1984) (holding that an intentional deprivation of property does not violate due process if a meaningful post-deprivation remedy is available); *Barnett v. Centoni*, 31 F.3d 813, 816-17 (9th Cir. 1994) (“California [l]aw provides an adequate post-deprivation remedy for any property deprivations.”).

AFFIRMED.