1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CURTIS RENEE JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

VS.

UNKNOWN,

Defendants.

1:13-cv-00943-AWI-GSA-PC

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO RULE 41 (Doc. 9; also resolves Doc. 8.)

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT PREJUDICE

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK TO:

- (1) CLOSE FILE, AND
- (2) SEND A COPY OF THIS ORDER AND A COPY OF PLAINTIFF'S LETTER OF JUNE 3, 2013 TO SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE THELTON E. HENDERSON (Doc. 1.)

I. BACKGROUND

Curtis Renee Jackson ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case was filed on June 14, 2013, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. (Doc. 1.) On June 19, 2013, the case was transferred to the Eastern District of California. (Doc. 5.)

On June 28, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion to dismiss this action. (Doc. 9.)

II. MOTION TO DISMISS – FED. R. CIV. P. 41(a)(1)

A. <u>Legal Standard</u>

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

In Wilson v. City of San Jose, the Ninth Circuit explained:

Under Rule 41(a)(1), a plaintiff has an absolute right to voluntarily dismiss his action prior to service by the defendant of an answer or a motion for summary judgment. Concha v. London, 62 F.3d 1493, 1506 (9th Cir. 1995) (citing Hamilton v. Shearson-Lehman American Express, 813 F.2d 1532, 1534 (9th Cir. 1987)). A plaintiff may dismiss his action so long as the plaintiff files a notice of dismissal prior to the defendant's service of an answer or motion for summary judgment. The dismissal is effective on filing and no court order is required. Id. The plaintiff may dismiss some or all of the defendants, or some or all of his claims, through a Rule 41(a)(1) notice. Id.; Pedrina v. Chun, 987 F.2d 608, 609-10 (9th Cir. 1993). The filing of a notice of voluntary dismissal with the court automatically terminates the action as to the defendants who are the subjects of the notice. Concha, 62 F.2d at 1506. Unless otherwise stated, the dismissal is ordinarily without prejudice to the plaintiff's right to commence another action for the same cause against the same defendants. Id. (citing McKenzie v. Davenport-Harris Funeral Home, 834 F.2d 930, 934-35 (9th Cir. 1987)). Such a dismissal leaves the parties as though no action had been brought. Id.

Wilson v. City of San Jose, 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997).

B. **Plaintiff's Motion**

Plaintiff asserts that on June 3, 2013, he wrote a letter, with supporting documents enclosed, specifically addressed to the Honorable Thelton Henderson, who is part of the three-judge panel monitoring medical care provided by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Plaintiff asserts that he never intended the letter to be filed as a civil rights complaint, and that he wrote the letter to inform Judge Henderson about the medical treatment Plaintiff received when blood was discovered in his urine. Plaintiff requests the court to dismiss this action and forward the filings from this action to the Honorable Thelton Henderson, as Plaintiff intended.

No defendant has filed an answer or motion for summary judgment in this action. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion shall be granted.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion to dismiss the complaint is GRANTED;
- 2. This action is DISMISSED in its entirety without prejudice; and

1	3. The Cle	rk of Court is DIRECTED to:
2	(1)	close the file in this case and adjust the docket to reflect voluntary
3		dismissal of this action pursuant to Rule 41(a); and
4	(2) s	send a copy of this order and a copy of Plaintiff's letter, with
5	8	attachments, dated June 3, 2013 (Doc. 1) to:
6		Senior District Judge Thelton E. Henderson United States District Court
7		San Francisco Courthouse 450 Golden Gate Avenue
8		San Francisco, California 94102
9		
10		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.	AMplin
12	Dated: <u>July 9, 2013</u>	SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		