### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

#### OCT 26 2022

FILED

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS Rec'd 11/02/2

### DANNY FABRICANT.

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

A. MIRANDA, individually and in his/her official capacity as Unit C-2 Case Manager: et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

The panel has voted to deny the petition for panel rehearing.

The full court has been advised of the petition for rehearing en banc and no

judge has requested a vote on whether to rehear the matter en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 35.

Fabricant's petition for panel rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc (Docket Entry No. 30) are denied.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

# No. 21-16345

Tucson

**ORDER** 

District of Arizona,

D.C. No. 4:19-cv-00029-JCH

#### NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

### DANNY FABRICANT,

v.

Plaintiff-Appellant,

A. MIRANDA, individually and in his/her official capacity as Unit C-2 Case Manager; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 21-16345

# FILED

MAY 26 2022

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

June 10, 22

D.C. No. 4:19-cv-00029-JCH

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Arizona John C. Hinderaker, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 17, 2022\*\*

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Federal prisoner Danny Fabricant appeals pro se from the district court's

summary judgment for failure to exhaust administrative remedies in his action

brought under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of

\* 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).

EXHIBIT A (NOTE: This page is two-sided)

for discovery because Fabricant did not show that the sought-after facts were essential to his opposition. *See Garrett v. City & County of San Francisco*, 818 F.2d 1515, 1518 (9th Cir. 1987) (setting forth standard of review).

## AFFIRMED.

21-16345

3

;