FILED

JAN 23 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RONALD HANSEN, Plaintiff - Appellant, v. CLARK COUNTY, Defendant - Appellee.	No. 07-16499 D.C. No. CV-05-00672-BES MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada
Brian E. Sandoval, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 14, 2009**
San Francisco, California

Before: BRIGHT,*** HUG, and REINHARDT, Circuit Judges.

---

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

*** The Honorable Myron H. Bright, Senior United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, sitting by designation.

Ronald Hansen appeals the district court's summary judgment in favor of Clark County for claimed violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), and 42 U.S.C. § 1983. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review the district court's grant of summary judgment de novo, *Davis v. Team Elec. Co.*, 520 F.3d 1080, 1088 (9th Cir. 2008), and we affirm.

The district court properly granted summary judgment on Hansen's Title VII and ADEA claims because Hansen has not raised a genuine issue of material fact that the County's proffered reasons for its employment decision were a pretext for discrimination. *See Diaz v. Eagle Produce Ltd. P'ship*, 521 F.3d 1201, 1212 (9th Cir. 2008); *Cornwell v. Electra Cent. Credit Union*, 439 F.3d 1018, 1028 (9th Cir. 2006). This failure to establish intentional discrimination under Title VII and the ADEA eviscerates his § 1983 claims based on the same conduct. *See Sischo-Nownejad v. Merced Cmty. Coll. Dist.*, 934 F.2d 1104, 1112 (9th Cir. 1991).

We decline Hansen's invitation to address his state law claim of negligent supervision. The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing the pendent state law claim once it had granted summary judgment on all federal claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3); *Moore v. Kayport Package Express, Inc.*, 885 F.2d 531, 537 (9th Cir. 1989).

AFFIRMED.