(PC)Smith v.	C.D.C.		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	KENNETH SMITH,		
11	Plaintiff, No. 2: 10-cv-2561 KJN P		
12	VS.		
13	C.D.C. PAROLE DIVISION, et al.,		
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>		
15			
16	Plaintiff is a former state prisoner proceeding without counsel. Plaintiff seeks		
17	relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and has requested leave to proceed in forma pauperis		
18	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This proceeding was referred to this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C.		
19	§ 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 302.		
20	Plaintiff has submitted a declaration that makes the showing required by		
21	28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Accordingly, the request to proceed in forma pauperis will be granted.		
22	The court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief		
23	against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C.		
24	§ 1915A(a). The court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised		
25	claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be		
26	granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.		
	1		

Doc. 8

28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1),(2).

A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227-28 (9th Cir. 1984). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous when it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327. The critical inquiry is whether a constitutional claim, however inartfully pleaded, has an arguable legal and factual basis. See Jackson v. Arizona, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1989); Franklin, 745 F.2d at 1227.

Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure "requires only 'a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,' in order to 'give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.'" Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). In order to survive dismissal for failure to state a claim, a complaint must contain more than "a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action;" it must contain factual allegations sufficient "to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." Id. However, "[s]pecific facts are not necessary; the statement [of facts] need only 'give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007) (quoting Bell Atlantic Corp., 550 U.S. at 555) (citations and internal quotations marks omitted). In reviewing a complaint under this standard, the court must accept as true the allegations of the complaint in question, id., and construe the pleading in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

Although not entirely clear, it appears that the named defendants are Parole Agent Williams and Dr. Zake. Plaintiff alleges that on February 25, 2001, defendants forced him to take medication against his will at the North B Street Sacramento Parole Region office. Plaintiff appears to claim that defendants threatened him, possibly with filing a parole violation, if he did not take the medication.

granted.

Plaintiff does not state the relief he seeks as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. For example, plaintiff does not state whether he seeks money damages, injunctive relief or both. For this reason, the complaint is dismissed with leave to amend.

If plaintiff chooses to amend the complaint, plaintiff must demonstrate how the conditions about which he complains resulted in a deprivation of plaintiff's constitutional rights. Rizzo v. Goode, 423 U.S. 362, 371 (1976). Also, the complaint must allege in specific terms how each named defendant is involved. Id. There can be no liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 unless there is some affirmative link or connection between a defendant's actions and the claimed deprivation. Id.; May v. Enomoto, 633 F.2d 164, 167 (9th Cir. 1980); Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978). Furthermore, vague and conclusory allegations of official participation in civil rights violations are not sufficient. Ivey v. Board of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982).

In addition, plaintiff is hereby informed that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to make plaintiff's amended complaint complete. Local Rule 220 requires that an amended complaint be complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading. This requirement exists because, as a general rule, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint. See Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). Once plaintiff files an amended complaint, the original pleading no longer serves any function in the case. Therefore, in an amended complaint, as in an original complaint, each claim and the involvement of each defendant must be sufficiently alleged.

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (Dkt. No. 7) is
- 2. Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed.
- 3. Within thirty days from the date of this order, plaintiff shall complete the attached Notice of Amendment and submit the following documents to the court:

1	a. The completed Notice of Amendment; and	
2	b. An original and one copy of the Amended Complaint.	
3	Plaintiff's amended complaint shall comply with the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, the	
4	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules of Practice. The amended complaint must	
5	also bear the docket number assigned to this case and must be labeled "Amended Complaint."	
6	Failure to file an amended complaint in accordance with this order may result in the dismissal of	
7	this action.	
8	DATED: December 8, 2010	
9		
10		
11	KENDALL J. NEWMAN	
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
13	sm2561.14	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EAST	TERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	KENNETH SMITH,		
11	Plaintiff,	No. 2: 10-cv-2561 KJN P	
12	VS.		
13	C.D.C. PAROLE DIVISION, et al.,	NOTICE OF AMENDMENT	
14	Defendants.		
15			
16	Plaintiff hereby submits	s the following document in compliance with the court's	
17	order filed:		
18		Amended Complaint	
19	DATED:		
20			
21		Plaintiff	
22			
23			
24			
2526			