



1 Gonzalez was responsible for placing him in administrative segregation, and it does not appear  
2 that a deputy would have that authority. Additionally, Plaintiff has failed to allege any acts or  
3 omissions by defendant Kern County Sherriff's Office that led to the alleged deprivation of  
4 Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment due process rights. Therefore, the Court will allow this claim  
5 to proceed only against Doe Defendant(s)." (ECF No. 44, p. 7).

6 Deputy Ramos does not appear to have anything to do with Plaintiff being put in  
7 disciplinary isolation from May 4, 2016, through November 22, 2016. While Plaintiff does  
8 mention that Deputy Ramos isolated Plaintiff, he alleges that the incident happened in 2015.  
9 Additionally, it is not clear what form this isolation took.

10 Because Deputy Ramos does not appear to be the Doe Defendant(s) in the claim allowed  
11 by the Court, the Court will deny Plaintiff's motion to substitute, without prejudice. If Deputy  
12 Ramos was the person responsible for the 2016 disciplinary isolation incident, Plaintiff may file  
13 another motion to substitute that lays out Deputy Ramos's involvement and explains why he is  
14 the Doe Defendant named in the complaint.

15 The Court notes that if Plaintiff wishes to add a claim to his complaint, he may file a  
16 motion to amend his complaint. However, given the multiple amendments the Court has already  
17 allowed, the Court is not inclined to grant further leave to amend.

18 Accordingly, based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to  
19 substitute Deputy Ramos as Defendant Doe 1 is DENIED.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: July 5, 2017

22 /s/ Eric P. Gray  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28