

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 20 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RYANT TRIMALE PRATT,

No. 18-15148

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:16-cv-01129-JD

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

B. HEDRICKS, Warden; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
James Donato, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 12, 2018\*\*

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

California state prisoner Ryant Trimale Pratt appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging a due process violation stemming from his disciplinary hearing. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1131 (9th Cir.

---

\* 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).

2000) (en banc). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Pratt's due process claim arising from a July 2013 disciplinary hearing because the result of that disciplinary hearing was overturned on appeal. *See Frank v. Schultz*, 808 F.3d 762, 764 (9th Cir. 2015) (administrative reversal may cure due process violations).

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

Appellees' motion to strike (Docket Entry No. 14) is denied.

**AFFIRMED.**