

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 RENATO D. QUEZADA,

Case: No. 1:11-cv-01254-GBC (PC)

9 Plaintiff,

10 ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE REGARDING
11 EXHAUSTION

12 v.

13 (Doc. 3)

14 MAURICE JUNIOUS, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16 /17 **I. Factual and Procedural Background**18 Renato D. Quezada (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis
19 in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 16, 2011, Plaintiff filed the
20 original complaint. (Doc. 3). On the form complaint, Plaintiff concedes that he has not exhausted
administrative remedies stating that the outcome is still pending. (Doc. 3 at 2).21 **II. Exhaustion Requirement**22 Pursuant to the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, “[n]o action shall be brought with
23 respect to prison conditions under [42 U.S.C. § 1983], or any other Federal law, by a prisoner
24 confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are
25 available are exhausted.” 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). Prisoners are required to exhaust the available
26 administrative remedies prior to filing suit. *Jones v. Bock*, 127 S.Ct. 910, 918-19 (2007); *McKinney*
27 *v. Carey*, 311 F.3d 1198, 1199-1201 (9th Cir. 2002). The Court must dismiss a case without
28 prejudice even when there is exhaustion while the suit is pending. *Lira v. Herrera*, 427 F.3d 1164,

1 1170 (9th Cir. 2005).

2 Exhaustion is required regardless of the relief sought by the prisoner. *Booth v. Churner*, 532
3 U.S. 731, 741, 121 S.Ct. 1819 (2001). A prisoner “must use all steps the prison holds out, enabling
4 the prison to reach the merits of the issue.” *Griffin v. Arpaio*, 557 F.3d 1117, 1119 (9th Cir. 2009);
5 *see also Brown v. Valoff*, 422 F.3d 926, 935 (9th Cir. 2005). A prisoner’s concession to
6 non-exhaustion is valid grounds for dismissal so long as no exception to exhaustion applies. 42
7 U.S.C. § 1997e(a); *Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315 F.3d 1108, 1120 (9th Cir. 2003).

8 The Court takes judicial notice of the fact that the California Department of Corrections and
9 Rehabilitation has an administrative grievance system for prisoner complaints. Cal. Code Regs., tit.
10 15 § 3084.1 (2008). The process is initiated by submitting a CDC Form 602. *Id.* at § 3084.2(a).
11 Four levels of appeal are involved, including the informal level, first formal level, second formal
12 level, and third formal level, also known as the “Director’s Level.” *Id.* at § 3084.5. Appeals must
13 be submitted within fifteen working days of the event being appealed, and the process is initiated by
14 submission of the appeal to the informal level, or in some circumstances, the first formal level. *Id.*
15 at §§ 3084.5, 3084.6(c).

16 In order to satisfy section 1997e(a), California state prisoners are required to use the available
17 process to exhaust their claims prior to filing suit. *Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 126 S.Ct. 2378,
18 2383 (2006); *McKinney*, 311 F.3d at 1199-1201. “[E]xhaustion is mandatory under the PLRA and
19 . . . unexhausted claims cannot be brought in court.” *Jones*, 127 S.Ct. at 918-19 (citing *Porter*, 435
20 U.S. at 524). “All ‘available’ remedies must now be exhausted; those remedies need not meet
21 federal standards, nor must they be ‘plain, speedy, and effective.’” *Porter*, 534 U.S. at 524 (quoting
22 *Booth*, 532 U.S. at 739 n.5). In this instance, Plaintiff conceded that he has not exhausted
23 administrative remedies.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **III. Conclusion and Order**

2 Because it is apparent that Plaintiff has not completed the grievance process, the Court
3 HEREBY ORDERS: Plaintiff SHALL SHOW CAUSE why the action should not be dismissed
4 for failure to exhaust administrative remedies within thirty (30) days of the date of service of
5 this order.

6

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: August 1, 2011

9 
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE