1			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	JEREMY JONES,	) Case No.: 1:14-cv-02045-DAD-SAB (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,	) ORDER ADDRESSING PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE TO THE COURT AND DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE A SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT WITHIN THIRTY DAYS FROM THE DATE OF SERVICE	
13	v.		
14	JIMENEZ, et al.,		
15	Defendants.	) ) [ECF No. 24]	
16		_)	
17	Plaintiff Jeremy Jones is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action		
18	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.		
19	On December 11, 2015, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint and found that		
20	Plaintiff stated a cognizable claim against Defendants Doctors Tate and Lee for deliberate indifference		
21	in violation of the Eighth Amendment, a cognizable claim against Defendants Wedertz, Stowers, and		
22	Stratton for conditions of confinement in violation of the Eighth Amendment, a cognizable claim for		
23	excessive force against Defendants Sigton, Chamberlin, Harris and Kephart, and a cognizable due		
24	process violation against Defendant Lundy; however, Plaintiff was advised that the incidents were not		
25	related and could not be joined in one action. (ECF No. 21.) Plaintiff was instructed, by way of		
26	amendment or notice, to choose which claim(s), if any, he wished to proceed on in this action. (Id.)		
27	Plaintiff was advised that if his amended complaint or notice violates Rule 20 despite the admonition,		
28	the Court would decide which claims shall proceed and dismiss any and all unrelated claims. (Id.)		

1 On February 16, 2016, Plaintiff filed a notice to the Court. Plaintiff indicates that he wishes to 2 proceed against Defendant Lundy for a due process violation during his rules violation hearing. However, Plaintiff indicates that he "would like to amend this complaint to add the name of the watch 3 commander Cpt. Lundy assigned to the hearing, C. Schuler, Correctional Lieutenant." (ECF No. 24, 4 Notice at 1.) Plaintiff also indicates he would like to amend the complaint to add "the names of the 5 LT that heard this on appeal along with the AW and CDW who all denied, refused to acknowledge 6 7 and signed off on a due process violation that was clearly pointed out to them in his appeal; J. Lamboy, Correctional Lieutenant, M. Bryant, Correctional Associate Warden, K. Holland, 8 Correctional Chief Deputy Warden, J. Zamora, Correctional Appeals Examiner Office of Appeals, and 9 D. Foster, Correctional Chief Office of Appeals." (Id. at 2.) Lastly, Plaintiff would like to modify his 10 11 prayer for relief. (Id.)

12 Because Plaintiff's notice indicates that Plaintiff wishes to amend the operative complaint, Plaintiff must file a second amended complaint setting for his due process claim against Defendant 13 Lundy, and any other amendments related to such claim as set forth in his notice. Plaintiff is advised, 14 however, that the second amended complaint must be complete in itself without reference to the prior 15 16 or superseded pleading, Local Rule 220, and Plaintiff's second amended complaint must identify how each individual defendant caused the deprivation of Plaintiff's constitutional or other federal rights. In 17 18 addition, Plaintiff may not present unrelated claims and/or defendants in his second amended 19 complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 18, 20. Furthermore, the Court is required to screen any and all complaints 20 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Lastly, with regard to Plaintiff's claim that he wishes to amend the 21 complaint to add individuals who were involved and/or denied his inmate grievances, Plaintiff is advised that "[t]he Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause protects persons against deprivations 22 23 of life, liberty, or property; and those who seek to invoke its procedural protection must establish that 24 one of these interests is at stake." Wilkinson v. Austin, 545 U.S. 209, 221, 125 S.Ct. 2384 (2005). Plaintiff does not a have protected liberty interest in the processing his appeals, and therefore, he 25 26 cannot pursue a claim for denial of due process with respect to the handling or resolution of his 27 appeals. Ramirez v. Galaza, 334 F.3d 850, 860 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing Mann v. Adams, 855 F.2d 639, 28 640 (9th Cir. 1988)).

2

1	F	ased on the foregoing it is H	FREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file a second amended
2	Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file a second amended complaint in compliance with this Court within <b>thirty (30) days</b> from the date of service of this order.		
	Compian	it in compliance with this Co	urt within thirty (50) days from the date of service of this order.
3		ODDEDED	
4		ORDERED.	Straf A Be
5	Dated:	February 18, 2016	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6			UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDGE
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
			3