In this § 1983 civil rights case, plaintiff claims: "Sacramento County Jail as been hold in jail with no evidences at all." From this is appears that plaintiff is challenging the fact of his pre-trial detention. Remedies lie under § 1983 only where the prisoner challenges the conditions of his confinement. See Rizzo v. Dawson, 778 F.2d 527, 531-32 (9th Cir. 1985). Because such does not to appear to be the case here, it also appears that plaintiff cannot state a claim for relief under §

25

26

Doc. 8

1983. 1 Because it does not appear possible that the deficiencies identified herein can be cured by amending the complaint, plaintiff is not 2 entitled to leave to amend prior to dismissal of the entire action. See 3 Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126, 1131 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc). Plaintiff shall show cause in writing, within 30 days of the date of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim. 4 Plaintiff is warned that failure to respond to this order may result in 5 dismissal of the action for the reasons outlined above, as well as for failure to prosecute and comply with court rules and orders. See Local Rule 110. 6 More than 30 days have elapsed and plaintiff has not responded to the court order to show cause. Therefore, both for the reasons stated in the order to show cause and for lack of prosecution and 8 failure to follow court orders, this action will be dismissed. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 10 11 1. This action is dismissed for failure to state a claim and for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders; and 12 13 2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment and close this file. 14 15 DATED: December 13, 2013 16 17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26