

APPENDIX A

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

APR 4 2024
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

LISA MARIE BELYEW,

No. 22-15495

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No.
2:17-cv-01213-JAM-JDP

v.

DUCH, Captain; et al.,

MEMORANDUM*

Defendants-Appellees.

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

Submitted April 4, 2024**

Before: BENNETT, BADE, and COLLINS, Circuit Judges.

Prisoner Lisa Belyew appeals pro se from the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of the Defendants due to Belyew's failure to exhaust available administrative remedies as to her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging violations of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. Belyew also argues the district court abused

* 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).*

court's grant of summary judgment and reverse the district court's award of costs.³

AFFIRMED in part, and REVERSED in part.

³ The parties shall bear their own costs on appeal. Belyew's motion for 'reversal of the U.S. District Court's ruling for summary judgment,' Dkt. 10, is DENIED as moot.

APPENDIX B

4a

4a

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LISA BELYEW,

No. 2:17-cv-01213-JAM-JDP (PC)

Plaintiff,

ORDER

A. DUCH, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On January 26, 2022, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

1111

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. The findings and recommendations filed January 26, 2022, are adopted in full;

3 2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment, ECF No. 53, is granted;

4 3. Plaintiff's claims against all defendants are dismissed without prejudice for failure to

5 exhaust administrative remedies; and

6 4. The Clerk of Court be directed to close the case.

7

8 DATED: March 16, 2022

9 /s/ John A. Mendez

10 THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

LISA MARIE BELYEW,

CASE NO: 2:17-CV-01213-JAM-JDP

v.

DUCH, ET AL.,

Decision by the Court. This action came before the Court. The issues have been tried, heard or decided by the judge as follows:

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED

**THAT JUDGMENT IS HEREBY ENTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
COURT'S ORDER FILED ON 3/16/2022**

Keith Holland
Clerk of Court

ENTERED: March 16, 2022

by: /s/ L. Mena-Sanchez

Deputy Clerk

7a

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

APR 18 2024

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

LISA MARIE BELYEWS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

DUCH, Captain; HADLEY, Lieutenant;
MORELAND, Custodial Officer; CALLUS,
Custodial Officer; BAYONETTA, Custodial
Officer; ACTON, Custodial Officer;
WEBBER, Custodial Officer; JONES;
SMITH, Custodial Officer; TROTT,
Custodial Officer; TROTT, Custodial
Officer,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 22-15495

D.C. No.
2:17-cv-01213-JAM-JDP
Eastern District of California,
Sacramento

ORDER

Before: BENNETT, BADE, and COLLINS, Circuit Judges.

The panel has unanimously voted to deny Appellant's Petition for Panel Rehearing. Dkt. No. 34. Accordingly, the Petition for Panel Rehearing is DENIED.