

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

TYRONE JAMES,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
MAXINE HARDEN,  
Defendant.

No. 2:16-cv-1730 KJM CKD PS

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By order filed August 3, 2016, plaintiff was ordered to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff has filed a response to the order to show cause.

The complaint names as a defendant plaintiff’s mother. Plaintiff alleges that defendant violated his civil rights. In the response to the order to show cause, plaintiff states that defendant “Maxine Harden is absolutely not a state actor.” ECF No. 4. It does not appear that defendant meets any of the four tests articulated by the Supreme Court for determining whether a private party’s conduct constitutes state action. Franklin v. Fox, 312 F.3d 423, 445 (9th Cir. 2002) (private individual’s action can amount to state action under (1) public function test, (2) joint action test, (3) state compulsion test, or (4) governmental nexus test).

/////  
/////

1           Because it does not appear plaintiff can allege facts, within the strictures of Federal Rule  
2 of Civil Procedure 11, that would support a claim that defendant is a state actor and plaintiff sets  
3 forth no other proper basis for subject matter jurisdiction, the complaint should be dismissed.

4           Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for lack of  
5 subject matter jurisdiction.

6           These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
7 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days  
8 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written  
9 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned  
10 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Failure to file objections  
11 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v.  
12 Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

13 Dated: August 22, 2016

14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16 4 james1730.nosmj.57

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28