1			
2			
3			
4 5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED S	TATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	WALTER RAPALO,	) Case No.: 1:11-cv-01695-LJO-BAM (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,	) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR	
13	v.	<ul><li>) LEAVE TO AMEND AND FILE A SECOND</li><li>) AMENDED COMPLAINT</li></ul>	
14	S. LOPEZ, et al.,	) (ECF No. 52)	
15	Defendants.	)	
16			
17		/	
18	I. Procedural Background		
19	Plaintiff Walter Rapalo ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis		
20	in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action proceeds against Defendants		
21	Lopez, Schaefer and Manasrah for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the		
22	Eighth Amendment. <sup>1</sup>		
23	On February 19, 2014, the Court issued a Discovery and Scheduling Order. Pursuant to that		
24	order, the deadline to amend pleadings was August 19, 2014. (ECF No. 27.)		
25 26	On March 6, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff		
26	also lodged his proposed second amended complaint. (ECF Nos. 51, 52.) Defendants opposed the		
27 28			
20	<sup>1</sup> Defendant Schaefer was erroneously sued as "So	chaffer."	
		1	

motion on March 24, 2015. (ECF No. 53.) No reply was filed and the motion is deemed submitted. Local Rule 230(1).

## II. Discussion

## A. Proposed Amendment

Plaintiff seeks to amend his complaint to add an Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim against the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation ("CDCR"). (ECF No. 52, p. 2.)

**B.** Legal Standard

As Plaintiff's request to amend is after expiration of the Scheduling Order deadline for amendment of pleadings, the Court must apply the standard for amending a scheduling order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16, rather than the liberal amendment standard of Rule 15. <u>Coleman</u> <u>v. Quaker Oats Co.</u>, 232 F.3d 1271, 1294-95 (9th Cir. 2000) (district court correctly addressed motion for leave to amend under Rule 16 because it had issued a pretrial scheduling order that established a timetable for amending the pleadings and the motion was filed after the deadline had expired).

Pursuant to Rule 16(b), a scheduling order "may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). The "good cause" standard "primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment." Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). The district court may modify the scheduling order "if it cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension." <u>Id.</u> If the party was not diligent, the inquiry should end. <u>Id.</u>

Here, Plaintiff's attempt to amend is untimely. Further, there is no indication that Plaintiff was
diligent in seeking amendment. Plaintiff made no effort to add his proposed cause of action against
CDCR prior to the relevant deadline to amend the pleadings in August 2014. Although Plaintiff
contends that he discovered the potential claim against CDCR based information obtained through
discovery, which is ongoing, his proposed amendment is nonetheless futile. The Eleventh
Amendment erects a general bar against federal lawsuits brought against the state. Wolfson v.
Brammer, 616 F.3d 1045, 1065-66 (9th Cir. 2010) (citation and quotation marks omitted). While
"[t]he Eleventh Amendment does not bar suits against a state official for prospective relief," Wolfson,

1

2

1	616 F.3d at 1065-66, suits against the state or its agencies are barred absolutely, regardless of the form		
2	of relief sought, e.g., Pennhurst State School & Hosp. v. Halderman, 465 U.S. 89, 100, 104 S.Ct. 900		
3	(1984); Buckwalter v. Nevada Bd. of Medical Examiners, 678 F.3d 737, 740 n.1 (9th Cir. 2012).		
4	Thus, Plaintiff may not maintain a claim against CDCR. Therefore, any amendment is futile.		
5	III. Conclusion and Order		
6	For the reasons stated, Plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended complaint is HEREBY		
7	DENIED.		
8			
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
10	Dated:April 9, 2015	1s/ Barbara A. McAulille	
11		IITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	3		