(PC)Harrington v	Bautista et al	Doc.
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DIS	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	GARRICK HARRINGTON,	) Case No.: 1:10-cv-01802-LJO-SAB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, FINDING COGNIZABLE STATE LAW CLAIMS AGAINST DEFENDANTS BAUTISTA, BLAYLOCK, JAMES, RUPP, AND
13	V.	
14	J. BAUTISTA, et al.,	HACKWORTH, FORWARDING PLAINTIFF NECESSARY SERVICE DOCUMENTS AS TO
15	Defendants.	<ul><li>DEFENDANTS JAMES, RUPP, AND</li><li>HACKWORTH</li></ul>
16		) [ECF No. 34]
17		) )
18		_)
19 20	Plaintiff Garrick Harrington is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action	
21	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
22	On May 9, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's April 1, 2014, order	
23	adopting the Findings and Recommendation issued January 7, 2014, dismissing Plaintiff's	
24	constitutional claim of deliberate indifference to a serious medical need against Defendant James, and	
25	dismissing Plaintiff's state claims against all Defendants. The Court found that Plaintiff stated a	
26	cognizable claim for failure to protect in violation of the Eighth Amendment against Defendants  Bautista and Blaylock only.	
27	Bautista and Biaylock only.	
28		
		1
	(1	

Doc. 36

In the present motion for reconsideration, Plaintiff contends that he stated a cognizable claim of deliberate indifference and state law negligence. As stated in the Court's January 7, 2014, Findings and Recommendation, Plaintiff fails to state a cognizable claim of deliberate indifference. However, based on the allegations presented in the First Amended Complaint and Plaintiff's alleged compliance with the California Tort Claims Act, the Court finds that Plaintiff states a cognizable claim for state-law based tort claim of negligence against Defendants Bautista, Blaylock, James, Rupp, and Hackworth, in addition to a claim of deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's safety against Defendants Bautista and Blaylock. Because Defendants James, Rupp, and Hackworth were not named as Defendants in the Court's January 7, 2014, service order, the Court will hereby forward the necessary service of process documents to Plaintiff for these Defendants to complete and return to the Court for initiation of service of process.

Based on the foregoing,

## IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part;
- 2. The Court's April 1, 2014, order dismissing Defendants S.L. Rupp, B. Hackworth, and L. James and Plaintiff's state law claim of negligence is **VACATED**;
- 3. Service shall be initiated on the following defendants:

## S.L. Rupp

## **B.** Hackworth

## L. James

- 4. The Clerk of the Court shall send Plaintiff three (3) USM-285 forms, three (3) summons, a Notice of Submission of Documents form, an instruction sheet and a copy of the First Amended Complaint filed August 14, 2013;
- 5. Within thirty (30) days from the date of this order, Plaintiff shall complete the attached Notice of Submission of Documents and submit the completed Notice to the Court with the following documents:
  - a. One completed summons for each defendant listed above;
  - b. One completed USM-285 form for each defendant listed above;