

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 21 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RONALD BROWNELL MARTIN,

No. 18-35768

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:18-cv-00741-RAJ

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT  
OF CORRECTIONS – EDUCATION;  
LONNIE ROBERTS, Correctional Program  
Manager,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Washington  
Richard A. Jones, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 19, 2019\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, SILVERMAN, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Washington state prisoner Ronald Brownell Martin appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action challenging his exclusion from community college classes. 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).

§ 1291. We review de novo a dismissal for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C.

§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998)

(order). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Martin's action because Martin failed to allege facts sufficient to show that he was deprived of a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. *See Chudacoff v. Univ. Med. Ctr. of S. Nev.*, 649 F.3d 1143, 1149 (9th Cir. 2011) (elements of § 1983 action); *Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 341-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (though pro se pleadings are to be liberally construed, a plaintiff must still present factual allegations sufficient to state a plausible claim for relief).

**AFFIRMED.**