O'Dell et al v. Ikeda et al

Doc. 3

28

to state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff "must allege a violation of a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and must show that the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under color of state law." West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). Private parties do not act "under color of state law" when they pursue unlawful detainer actions in court. Cutlip v. Deutche Bank Nat'l Trust Co. for Harborview Mortg. Loan Trust Pass-Through Certificates 2007-7, No. 15-CV-01345-BLF, 2015 WL 1928257, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2015) ("[M]erely resorting to the courts and being on the winning side of a lawsuit does not make a party a co-conspirator or a joint actor with the judge."), quoting Dennis v. Sparks, 449 U.S. 24, 28 (1980); Brambila v. Reo Bay Area, LP, No. C 11-03202 SI, 2011 WL 4031142, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2011) ("Use of the unlawful detainer process standing alone does not transform acts by a private party into acts under color of law for purposes of § 1983.")

Before re-filing their pleadings, Plaintiffs should carefully consider their options and should only re-file their complaint if they believe that can allege facts sufficient to state a claim against each defendant they name. If Plaintiffs decide that they do not wish to re-file their complaint, they should so inform the Court by filing a notice indicating that they wish to dismiss their case.

In accordance with Rule 5.2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court hereby STRIKES the filings (ECF Nos. 1, 2) from the docket and directs Plaintiffs to re-file the documents in manner that complies with the rules of this Court within **14 days**. For the protection of the minors, the Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to place the filings (ECF Nos. 1, 2) under seal.

Failure to follow the directives of this order will result in dismissal of this action. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 11, 2017

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE