UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
PATRICK BLACKSHIRE,	No. 2:15-cv-1123 MCE CKD PS
Plaintiff,	
v.	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF,	
Defendant.	
Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se and in forma pauperis. Plaintiff has filed a	
third amended complaint.	
The federal in forma pauperis statute authorizes federal courts to dismiss a case if the	
action is legally "frivolous or malicious," fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted,	
or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §	
1915(e)(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 where it is based on an	
indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. Neitzke,	
490 U.S. at 327.	
/////	
	PATRICK BLACKSHIRE, Plaintiff, v. SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF, Defendant. Plaintiff is proceeding in this action p third amended complaint. The federal in forma pauperis statute action is legally "frivolous or malicious," fail or seeks monetary relief from a defendant wh 1915(e)(2). A claim is legally frivolous when it la Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989) Cir. 1984). The court may, therefore, dismiss indisputably meritless legal theory or where t 490 U.S. at 327.

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

In this action, plaintiff alleges only state law claims against the Sacramento County Sheriff arising out of an allegedly delayed release from custody. Plaintiff was previously advised of the standards for stating a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. ECF Nos. 5, 7. The third amended complaint does not cure the pleading deficiencies evident in the original complaint, first or second amended complaints. Plaintiff fails to demonstrate how the conduct of the named defendant resulted in a deprivation of plaintiff's federal rights. See Ellis v. Cassidy, 625 F.2d 227 (9th Cir. 1980).

Plaintiff has now filed four complaints in this action. The third amended complaint still fails to state a claim under section 1983 and, at best, alleges only a state law claim for negligence. Despite repeated opportunities to cure the deficiencies in his complaints, plaintiff has failed to do so. Moreover, it appears that further amendment would be futile.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned

1	"Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file objection	
2	within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v	
3	<u>Ylst</u> , 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).	
4	Dated: July 24, 2015	Carola U. Delany
5		CAROLYN K. DELANEY
6		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7	4 blackshire1123.57	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		