UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DEANDRE SILAS,	Case No. 1:23-cv-0669-BAM (PC)
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO RANDOMLY ASSIGN DISTRICT JUDGE
BARBOSA, Defendant.	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS ACTION FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM
	(ECF No. 11) FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff DeAndre Silas ("Plaintiff") is a former state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court screened Plaintiff's complaint, and he was granted leave to amend. Plaintiff's first amended complaint is currently before the Court for screening. (ECF No. 11.)

I. Screening Requirement and Standard

The Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity and/or against an officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). Plaintiff's complaint, or any portion thereof, is subject to dismissal if it is frivolous or malicious, if it fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or if it seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b).

A complaint must contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief" Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Detailed factual allegations are not required, but "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citing *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). While a plaintiff's allegations are taken as true, courts "are not required to indulge unwarranted inferences." *Doe I v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 572 F.3d 677, 681 (9th Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

To survive screening, Plaintiff's claims must be facially plausible, which requires sufficient factual detail to allow the Court to reasonably infer that each named defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quotation marks omitted); *Moss v. U.S. Secret Serv.*, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009). The sheer possibility that a defendant acted unlawfully is not sufficient, and mere consistency with liability falls short of satisfying the plausibility standard. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quotation marks omitted); *Moss*, 572 F.3d at 969.

II. Plaintiff's Allegations

Plaintiff is currently housed at California Health Care Facility in Stockton, California.

Plaintiff alleges that the events in the complaint occurred while he was housed at California State

Prison at Corcoran. Plaintiff names Barbosa, Peace Officer, as the sole defendant.

Plaintiff alleges: "I was denied my right to medical care which lead to cruel and unusual punishment." As factual support of his claim, Plaintiff alleges: "On 12-24-22 during medication pass c/o Barbosa refused to open my tray slot so the medical nurse could give me my medication because I suffer from a mental disability which only got worse from me not taking my medication."

As remedies, Plaintiff requests compensatory damages.

III. Discussion

Plaintiff's complaint fails to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and fails to state a cognizable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

A. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8

Pursuant to Rule 8, a complaint must contain "a short and plain statement of the claim

showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Detailed factual allegations are not required, but "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citation omitted). Plaintiff must set forth "sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). While factual allegations are accepted as true, legal conclusions are not. *Id.*; *see also Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556–57; *Moss*, 572 F.3d at 969.

Here, Plaintiff's complaint is short, but not a plain statement of his claims. Much of Plaintiff's allegations is conclusory as to what happened or when it happened. In the Court's prior screening, Plaintiff was informed that he should state his key factual allegations in the body of the complaint and to comply with the provided legal standards. Plaintiff has been unable to cure this deficiency to include factual allegations identifying what happened, when it happened and who was involved. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.

B. Eight Amendment Deliberate Indifference to Medical Care

Plaintiff may be attempting to allege a claim for deliberate indifference to medical care. A prisoner's claim of inadequate medical care constitutes cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment where the mistreatment rises to the level of "deliberate indifference to serious medical needs." *Jett v. Penner*, 439 F.3d 1091, 1096 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976)). The two-part test for deliberate indifference requires Plaintiff to show (1) "a 'serious medical need' by demonstrating that failure to treat a prisoner's condition could result in further significant injury or the 'unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain," and (2) "the defendant's response to the need was deliberately indifferent." *Jett*, 439 F.3d at 1096.

A defendant does not act in a deliberately indifferent manner unless the defendant "knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety." *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994). "Deliberate indifference is a high legal standard," *Simmons v. Navajo Cty. Ariz.*, 609 F.3d 1011, 1019 (9th Cir. 2010); *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1060 (9th Cir. 2004), and is shown where there was "a purposeful act or failure to respond to a prisoner's pain or possible

medical need" and the indifference caused harm. *Jett*, 439 F.3d at 1096. In applying this standard, the Ninth Circuit has held that before it can be said that a prisoner's civil rights have been abridged, "the indifference to his medical needs must be substantial. Mere 'indifference,' 'negligence,' or 'medical malpractice' will not support this cause of action." *Broughton v. Cutter Labs.*, 622 F.2d 458, 460 (9th Cir. 1980) (citing *Estelle*, 429 U.S. at 105–06). Even gross negligence is insufficient to establish deliberate indifference to serious medical needs. *See Wood v. Housewright*, 900 F.2d 1332, 1334 (9th Cir. 1990).

Liberally construing the first amended complaint, Plaintiff states a serious medical need for a mental disability. However, Plaintiff has not alleged facts that Defendant's response was deliberately different. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant did not open the tray slot during a medication pass. Plaintiff fails to allege facts that Defendant knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to inmate health or safety. Plaintiff fails to allege that Defendant knew he was denying medication, knew Plaintiff needed medical or had a serious medical need, or that Defendant deliberately did not allow medication. Plaintiff has been unable to cure this deficiency.

IV. Conclusion and Recommendation

For the reasons discussed, the Court finds that Plaintiff fails to state a cognizable claim for relief. Despite being provided with the relevant legal standards, Plaintiff has been unable to cure the deficiencies in his complaint. Further leave to amend is not warranted. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000).

Accordingly, the Court HEREBY DIRECTS the Clerk of the Court to randomly assign a district judge to this action.

Further, for the reasons stated above, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim upon which relief may be granted.

These Findings and Recommendation will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within **fourteen** (14) days after being served with these Findings and Recommendation, Plaintiff may file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's

1	Findings and Recommendation." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the
2	specified time may result in the waiver of the "right to challenge the magistrate's factual
3	findings" on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing Baxter v.
4	Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).
5	
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7	Dated: July 12, 2023 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
8	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	