1	1		
2	2		
3	3		
4	4		
5	5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8 9	MARK EVAN GRANGETTO, by and) 1:07cv	0438 LJO DLB	
10	Weber,)	R REGARDING DEFENDANTS'	
11)	ON TO DISMISS	
12		nent 22)	
13	13 CAL TERHUNE, et al.,		
14	14		
15	15 Defendants.		
16	16		
17	Defendants Derral G. Adams and David J. Kyle, M.D. ("Defendants") filed the instant		
18	18 motion to dismiss on February 27, 2009. The matter w	motion to dismiss on February 27, 2009. The matter was heard on April 3, 2009, before the	
19	19 Honorable Dennis L. Beck, United States Magistrate Ju	Honorable Dennis L. Beck, United States Magistrate Judge. James Flynn appeared on behalf of	
20	Defendants. Cindy Cannon appeared on behalf of Plaintiff Mark Grangetto, by and through his		
21	Guardian Ad Litem Nora Weber ("Plaintiff").		
22	22 Defendants' motion to dismiss was based, in pa	Defendants' motion to dismiss was based, in part, on abstention principles. There are two	
23	actions currently proceeding in state court that involve Plaintiff's current mental competency- an		
24	ongoing probate matter and a recent <u>Keyhea¹</u> proceeding	ongoing probate matter and a recent <u>Keyhea¹</u> proceeding initiated by Defendants. The outcome	
25	25 of these state proceedings could possibly conflict with	of these state proceedings could possibly conflict with this Court's determination on Plaintiff's	
26	26		
27			
28	¹ <u>Keyhea v. Rushen</u> , 178 Cal.App.3d 526 (1986) (setting forth the procedures for involuntary administration of antipsychotic medications).		

1	claims for injunctive relief and abstention would therefore be proper under <u>Younger</u> . <u>Gilbertson</u>	
2	v. Albright, 381 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2004).	
3	At the hearing, Plaintiff proposed filing an amended complaint that deleted the claims for	
4	injunctive relief and instead focused on Plaintiff's damages claims for the period prior to the	
5	filing of this action. Defendants did not object to this proposal.	
6	Accordingly, pursuant to the parties' discussion at the hearing, Plaintiff SHALL file an	
7	amended complaint within twenty (20) days. Defendants SHALL respond to the amended	
8	complaint within twenty (20) days from the date of service.	
9	Defendants' motion to dismiss is therefore DENIED as MOOT.	
10		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
12	Dated: <u>April 3, 2009</u> /s/ Dennis L. Beck UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	