

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 RICK HAZELTINE,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 FRANCES HICKS, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

1:14-cv-00056-DAD-GSA-PC

ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S
OBJECTION TO REPEATED
SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL
(ECF No. 80.)

17 Rick Hazeltine ("Plaintiff") is a civil detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*
18 with this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case now proceeds with
19 Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint filed on July 6, 2015, on the following claim: Excessive
20 force in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment against defendants Ian Young, Benjamin
21 Gamez, Rashaun Casper, Julius Oldan, Porfirio Sanchez Negrete, David Avilia, Rickey Smith,
22 and Charles Ho (collectively "Defendants"). (ECF No. 27.)

23 On December 26, 2017, Plaintiff filed an objection to Defendants' repeated
24 substitutions of counsel. (ECF No. 80.) Plaintiff contends that because Defendants have not
25 stated a valid reason for the substitutions, the substitutions appear "suspicious." (Id. at 1:23.)
26 Plaintiff asserts that since the beginning of this case, Coalinga State Hospital, Defendants'
27 employer, has "lied, manipulated, tampered with mail, committed perjury, etc., all in what
28 appears to be an attempt to effectuate a desired outcome on behalf of the defendants." (Id. at

1 1:23-27.) Plaintiff asserts that each time he has shown that wrongdoing exists in this case,
2 counsel is abruptly substituted.

3 Plaintiff also argues that this case is unfair because Defendants have received free
4 professional representation, even though they unjustly assaulted Plaintiff, while Plaintiff is a
5 high school dropout with no formal training in law. Plaintiff asserts that he is the victim, yet
6 has no investigators or other assistants to help him.

7 Plaintiff presents no evidence except his own speculation that Defendants are involved
8 in any wrongdoing with respect to their substitutions of counsel. Plaintiff's argument that this
9 case is unfair because he is representing himself is unavailing. Therefore, Plaintiff's objection
10 to Defendants' repeated substitutions of counsel shall be overruled.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's objection, filed on December
12 26, 2017 is OVERRULED.

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: January 8, 2018

/s/ Gary S. Austin
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28