

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ED’JUAN SCOTT,
Plaintiff,
v.
CDCR, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-0578 DB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff appears to be a mentally ill inmate who claims he was ordered to be treated with electro-shock therapy in 2011 and continues to be subjected to electro-shock therapy “remotely.” Plaintiff has consented to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge.

By order filed March 1, 2017, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. On April 11, 2017, plaintiff was given an additional thirty days in which to file an amended complaint. In a document filed April 24, 2017, plaintiff sought an extension of time.

On May 23, 2017, the court ordered the Office of the Attorney General to address plaintiff’s allegations concerning his mental health care. On June 6, the Attorney General’s Office filed a response to the court’s May 23 order. Therein, the state explains: (1) the Contra Costa County Superior Court has no record of ordering plaintiff to undergo electro-shock therapy;

1 (2) plaintiff has not undergone electro-shock therapy during his incarceration at CSP-Sacramento;
2 (3) plaintiff is not currently undergoing electro-shock therapy; and (4) electro-shock therapy is
3 not administered at CSP-Sacramento.

4 On June 16, 2017, the court granted plaintiff's request for an extension of time, advising
5 plaintiff that he must attempt to state any claims he may have about the past administration of
6 electro-shock therapy. Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint. Finally, on August 2, 2017,
7 the court gave plaintiff one, final opportunity to file an amended complaint within thirty days.
8 Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's August 2, 2017
9 order.

10 Plaintiff was advised in the August 2 order that if he failed to file a timely amended
11 complaint, this case would be dismissed. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this
12 action is dismissed without prejudice. See E.D. Cal. R. 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

13 Dated: September 15, 2017

14
15 
16 DEBORAH BARNES
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18
19
20

21 DLB:9
22 DLB1/prisoner-civil rights/scot0578.final
23
24
25
26
27
28