(PC) Nguyen v. Bick et al

Doc. 19

This exhaustion requirement is mandatory. <u>Booth v. Churner</u>, 532 U.S. 731, 741 (2001)." <u>McKinney v. Carey</u>, 311 F.3d 1198, 1199 (9th Cir. Dec. 5, 2002). Exhaustion must precede the filing of the complaint; compliance with the statute is not achieved by satisfying the exhaustion requirement during the course of an action. Id. at 1200.

California's Department of Corrections provides a four-step grievance process for prisoners who seek review of an administrative decision or perceived mistreatment. Within fifteen working days of "the event or decision being appealed," the inmate must ordinarily file an "informal" appeal, through which "the appellant and staff involved in the action or decision attempt to resolve the grievance informally." Cal.Code Regs., tit. 15, §§ 3084.5(a), 3084.6(c). [Footnote omitted.] If the issue is not resolved during the informal appeal, the grievant next proceeds to the first formal appeal level, usually conducted by the prison's Appeals Coordinator. Id. §§ 3084.5(b), 3084.6(c). Next are the second level, providing review by the institution's head or a regional parole administrator, and the third level, in which review is conducted by a designee of the Director of the Department of Corrections. [Footnote omitted.] Id. § 3084.5(e)(1)-(2).

Brown v. Valoff, 422 F.3d 926, 929-30 (9th Cir. 2005.) It is unclear from plaintiff's filing whether he has completed the administrative grievance process on his three potential cases.

The issues raised in plaintiff's filing, however, do not bear relevance to the instant action because it concerns defendants' failure to provide plaintiff with back surgery.

Accordingly, plaintiff must file new actions to address the claims raised in his August 13, 2009 filing. Plaintiff is advised that the court cannot offer legal advice or assistance in the filing of his cases. The court can, however, provide plaintiff with the forms necessary to do so.

To the extent plaintiff seeks the appointment of counsel to represent him in the instant action, his request is denied for the same reasons cited in this court's May 29, 2009 order denying plaintiff's May 5, 2009 request.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's August 13, 2009 motion for the appointment of counsel is denied.

25 /////

2.4

26 /////

1	
2	a civil
3	paupe
4	DATE
5	
6	
7	
8	/mp/001
9	nguy298
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

26

2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to send plaintiff three forms necessary to file a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and three applications to proceed in forma pauperis.

DATED: August 24, 2009.

nguy2983.31(2)