1			
1			
2			
3			
4 5			
5			
0 7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9 10	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	LEONICIO DE JESUS	No. 2:16-cv-2375 KJM CKD P	
11	LEONICIO DE JESUS,	NO. 2:10-CV-2575 KJWI CKD P	
	Plaintiff,	ODDED	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>	
14	MICHAEL MARTEL, et al.,		
15	Defendants.		
16			
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in this civil rights action pursuant		
18	to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This proceeding was referred to this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)		
19	and Local Rule 302.		
20	I. Procedural History		
21	Plaintiff's civil rights action initiated in the San Joaquin Superior Court was removed to this		
22	court on October 4, 2016. This court screened the five page complaint on December 7, 2016 and		
23	dismissed it with leave to amend for failing to state a claim. Following three extensions of time		
24	plaintiff filed a 511 page amended complaint including exhibits. The amended complaint names		
25	forty-five defendants and contains a table of contents that is over twenty pages long. In this		
26	voluminous pleading, plaintiff asserts that "he speaks for the entire Spanish speaking CDCR		
27	prison community" ECF No. 13 at 46.		
28	////		
		1	

Also pending before the court is defendants' motion for screening of plaintiff's complaint which was filed a mere two days after the amended complaint.¹ ECF No. 14.

3

II.

1

2

Screening Standard

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires that a complaint contain "'a short and 4 5 plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,' in order to 'give the 6 defendant fair notice of what the ... claim is and the grounds upon which it rests."" Bell Atlantic 7 Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (internal citation omitted). To comply with Rule 8, 8 a plaintiff should set forth "who is being sued, for what relief, and on what theory, with enough 9 detail to guide discovery." McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 1996). Conclusory 10 allegations are insufficient. See Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (stating that Rule 8 11 "demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation"; a pleading 12 that "offers labels and conclusions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action 13 will not do.") (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

14 The complaint does not comply with the standards of Rule 8. As set forth above,

15 plaintiff's allegations contain a laundry list of defendants but fails to identify how each particular

16 defendant is liable for each of the alleged constitutional violations. The court is not required to

17 ferret through plaintiff's allegations and all of the attached documents in search of viable claims,

18 Independent Towers of Wash. v. Wash., 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003), and plaintiff's failure

19 to plainly and succinctly provide each defendant with fair notice of the bases for his allegations

20 violates Rule 8. See Cafasso v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., Inc., 637 F.3d 1047, 1059 (9th Cir.

21 2011); see also American Ass'n of Naturopathic Physicians v. Hayhurst, 227 F.3d 1104, 1107-08

22 (9th Cir. 2000) ("[A] pro se litigant is not excused from knowing the most basic pleading

23 requirements."). Merely attaching hundreds of pages of documents, without specific allegations

24 demonstrating how those documents support his claims, is not sufficient.

25

////

26

 ¹ The court notes that this boilerplate motion was filed when defendants chose to remove this
action from state court as well as immediately after plaintiff filed the amended complaint. The
filing of repetitious, seriatim motions pointing out the court's duty to screen § 1983 complaints is
more burdensome than helpful.

In sum, the Complaint is subject to dismissal under Rule 8. However, the court will grant
plaintiff leave to amend.

3 If plaintiff chooses to file a second amended complaint, plaintiff must demonstrate how 4 the conditions complained of have resulted in a deprivation of plaintiff's federal constitutional or 5 statutory rights. See Ellis v. Cassidy, 625 F.2d 227 (9th Cir. 1980). Also, the second amended 6 complaint must allege in specific terms how each named defendant is involved. There can be no 7 liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 unless there is some affirmative link or connection between a 8 defendant's actions and the claimed deprivation. Rizzo v. Goode, 423 U.S. 362 (1976); May v. 9 Enomoto, 633 F.2d 164, 167 (9th Cir. 1980); Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 10 1978). Furthermore, vague and conclusory allegations of official participation in civil rights 11 violations are not sufficient. Ivey v. Board of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982). 12 In addition, plaintiff is informed that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to 13 make plaintiff's second amended complaint complete. Local Rule 220 requires that an amended 14 complaint be complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading. This is because, as a 15 general rule, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint. See Loux v. Rhay, 375 16 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). Once plaintiff files a second amended complaint, the original 17 pleading no longer serves any function in the case. Therefore, in a second amended complaint, as 18 in an original complaint, each claim and the involvement of each defendant must be sufficiently 19 alleged. 20 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 21 1. Plaintiff's first amended complaint is dismissed; 22 2. Defendants' motion for screening (ECF No. 14) is denied as moot; and 23 3. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of service of this order to file a second 24 amended complaint that complies with the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, the Federal Rules 25 of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules of Practice. The second amended complaint must bear the docket number assigned this case and must be labeled "Second Amended Complaint." 26 27 ///// 28 /////

	11	
1	Failure to file a second amended complaint in accordance with this order will result in a	
2	recommendation that this action be dismissed.	
3	Dated: June 8, 2017	Carop U. Delany
4 5		CAROLYN K. DELANEY / UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11	12/deju2375.14amd.new.docx	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18 10		
19 20		
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		4