1

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	ZANE HUBBARD, No. 2:15-CV-2279-JAM-CMK-P
12	Plaintiff,
13	vs. <u>FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
14	GARY S. AUSTIN, et al.,
15	Defendants.
16	/
17	Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to
18	42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1).
19	The court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief
20	against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. See 28 U.S.C.
21	§ 1915A(a). The court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if it: (1) is frivolous or
22	malicious; (2) fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; or (3) seeks monetary relief
23	from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), (2). Moreover,
24	the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require that complaints contain a " short and plain
25	statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).
26	This means that claims must be stated simply, concisely, and directly. See McHenry v. Renne,
	1

84 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 1996) (referring to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(e)(1)). These rules are satisfied
if the complaint gives the defendant fair notice of the plaintiff's claim and the grounds upon
which it rests. See Kimes v. Stone, 84 F.3d 1121, 1129 (9th Cir. 1996). Because plaintiff must
allege with at least some degree of particularity overt acts by specific defendants which support
the claims, vague and conclusory allegations fail to satisfy this standard. Additionally, it is
impossible for the court to conduct the screening required by law when the allegations are vague
and conclusory.

8 For defendants, plaintiff names 12 judges of this court. Plaintiff claims that
9 defendants "have me unlawfully, and innocently, entrapped and falsely imprisoned in a state
10 prison. . . ." Plaintiff requests that the defendant judges be "punished for contempt."

Judges are absolutely immune from damage actions for judicial acts taken within
the jurisdiction of their courts. <u>See Schucker v. Rockwood</u>, 846 F.2d 1202, 1204 (9th Cir. 1988)
(per curiam). This immunity is lost only when the judge acts in the clear absence of all
jurisdiction or performs an act that is not judicial in nature. <u>See id</u>. Judges retain their immunity
even when they are accused of acting maliciously or corruptly, <u>see Mireles v. Waco</u>, 502 U.S. 9,
11 (1991) (per curiam); <u>Stump v. Sparkman</u>, 435 U.S. 349, 356-57 (1978), and when they are
accused of acting in error, <u>see Meek v. County of Riverside</u>, 183 F.3d 962, 965 (9th Cir. 1999).

Plaintiff in this case does <u>not</u> allege any facts which would suggest that the
defendant judges acted in the clear absence of all jurisdiction or performed acts non-judicial in
nature. Given that plaintiff fails to allege facts which would pierce judicial immunity, this matter
should be dismissed.

Because it does not appear possible that the deficiencies identified herein can be
cured by amending the complaint, plaintiff is not entitled to leave to amend prior to dismissal of
the entire action. See Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126, 1131 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc).
///

26 ///

Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends that this action be dismissed.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 14 days
after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
objections with the court. Responses to objections shall be filed within 14 days after service of
objections. Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal.
<u>See Martinez v. Ylst</u>, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

DATED: February 23, 2016

**CRAIG M. KELLISON** UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE