



1 A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.  
2 Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227-28 (9th  
3 Cir. 1984). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an  
4 indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. Neitzke,  
5 490 U.S. at 327.

6 In order to avoid dismissal for failure to state a claim a complaint must contain more than  
7 “naked assertions,” “labels and conclusions” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause  
8 of action.” Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-557 (2007). In other words,  
9 “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory  
10 statements do not suffice.” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009). Furthermore, a claim  
11 upon which the court can grant relief has facial plausibility. Twombly, 550 U.S. at 570. “A  
12 claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw  
13 the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” Iqbal, 129 S. Ct.  
14 at 1949. When considering whether a complaint states a claim upon which relief can be granted,  
15 the court must accept the allegations as true, Erickson v. Pardus, 127 S. Ct. 2197, 2200 (2007),  
16 and construe the complaint in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, see Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416  
17 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

18 The court finds the allegations in plaintiff’s complaint so vague and conclusory that it is  
19 unable to determine whether the current action is frivolous or fails to state a claim for relief. The  
20 court has determined that the complaint does not contain a short and plain statement as required  
21 by Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Although the Federal Rules adopt a flexible pleading policy, a  
22 complaint must give fair notice and state the elements of the claim plainly and succinctly. Jones  
23 v. Community Redev. Agency, 733 F.2d 646, 649 (9th Cir. 1984). Plaintiff must allege with at  
24 least some degree of particularity overt acts which defendants engaged in that support plaintiff’s  
25 claim. Id. Because plaintiff has failed to comply with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2),  
26 the complaint must be dismissed. The court will, however, grant leave to file an amended  
27 complaint.

28 ////

1 If plaintiff chooses to amend the complaint, plaintiff must set forth the jurisdictional  
2 grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a).  
3 Further, plaintiff must demonstrate how the conduct complained of has resulted in a deprivation  
4 of plaintiff's federal rights. See Ellis v. Cassidy, 625 F.2d 227 (9th Cir. 1980). Because several  
5 defendants have previously been dismissed with prejudice, only claims against defendants Lisa  
6 Robinson and Karin Tausan may be alleged. Further, plaintiff may not name any additional  
7 defendants or plaintiffs.

8 In addition, plaintiff is informed that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to  
9 make plaintiff's amended complaint complete. Local Rule 15-220 requires that an amended  
10 complaint be complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading. This is because, as a  
11 general rule, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint. See Loux v. Rhay, 375  
12 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). Once plaintiff files an amended complaint, the original pleading no  
13 longer serves any function in the case. Therefore, in an amended complaint, as in an  
14 original complaint, each claim and the involvement of each defendant must be sufficiently  
15 alleged.

16 Plaintiff has filed an interlocutory appeal of the court's order dismissing certain  
17 defendants and requests that the action be stayed pending appeal. Appeals of interlocutory orders  
18 do not transfer jurisdiction to the appellate court and thus do not strip the district court of  
19 jurisdiction to conduct further proceedings in the case. Ruby v. Secretary of Navy, 365 F.2d 385,  
20 388-89 (9th Cir.1966). The court does not find a stay is warranted in the circumstances of this  
21 case.

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

- 23 1. Plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 99) is granted;
- 24 2. Plaintiff's amended complaint is dismissed; and
- 25 3. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of service of this order to file a second  
26 amended complaint that complies with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,  
27 and the Local Rules of Practice; the second amended complaint may allege claims only against  
28 defendants Lisa Robinson and Karin Tausan; the second amended complaint may not join any

1 additional plaintiffs; the second amended complaint must bear the docket number assigned this  
2 case and must be labeled "Second Amended Complaint"; plaintiff must file an original and two  
3 copies of the second amended complaint; failure to file a second amended complaint in  
4 accordance with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed.

5 4. Plaintiff's motion for stay pending appeal (ECF No. 101) is denied.

6 Dated: April 4, 2014

7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
4 gionis.cuo