

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

12 Because Plaintiff’s notice indicates that Plaintiff wishes to amend the operative complaint,
13 Plaintiff must file a second amended complaint setting for his due process claim against Defendant
14 Lundy, and any other amendments related to such claim as set forth in his notice. Plaintiff is advised,
15 however, that the second amended complaint must be complete in itself without reference to the prior
16 or superseded pleading, Local Rule 220, and Plaintiff’s second amended complaint must identify how
17 each individual defendant caused the deprivation of Plaintiff’s constitutional or other federal rights. In
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
22 advised that “[t]he Fourteenth Amendment’s Due Process Clause protects persons against deprivations
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).
25 Plaintiff does not have a protected liberty interest in the processing his appeals, and therefore, he
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)).

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

Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file a second amended complaint in compliance with this Court within **thirty (30) days** from the date of service of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 18, 2016


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE