NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 13 2018

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

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

KELVIN X. SINGLETON, AKA Kelvin Lewis Singleton,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

SCOTT KERNAN; et al.,

v.

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 17-56727

D.C. No. 3:16-cv-02462-BAS-NLS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of California Cynthia A. Bashant, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 10, 2018**

Before: CANBY, W. FLETCHER, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Kelvin X. Singleton, aka Kelvin Lewis Singleton, appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for reconsideration of the order denying his motion for a preliminary injunction in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging retaliation. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.

^{*} 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).

§ 1292(a)(1). We review for an abuse of discretion. *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Singleton's motion for reconsideration because Singleton failed to demonstrate any basis for relief. *See id.* at 1263 (grounds for relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e)); *see also Jackson v. City & County of San Francisco*, 746 F.3d 953, 958 (9th Cir. 2014) (plaintiff seeking preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the balance of equities tips in his favor, and an injunction is in the public interest).

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

Singleton's request for judicial notice, set forth in the opening brief, is denied as unnecessary.

AFFIRMED.

2 17-56727