1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 No. 2:17-cv-0070 KJN P RONALD LEE CANADA, 12 Plaintiff, 13 V. ORDER 14 MACOMBER, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner, proceeding pro se. Plaintiff seeks relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 18 § 1983, and has requested leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This 19 proceeding was referred to this court by Local Rule 302 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). 20 Plaintiff submitted a declaration that makes the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). 21 Accordingly, the request to proceed in forma pauperis will be granted. 22 Plaintiff is required to pay the statutory filing fee of \$350.00 for this action. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a), 1915(b)(1). By this order, plaintiff will be assessed an initial partial filing fee in 23 accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). By separate order, the court will direct 24 25 the appropriate agency to collect the initial partial filing fee from plaintiff's trust account and 26 forward it to the Clerk of the Court. Thereafter, plaintiff will be obligated to make monthly payments of twenty percent of the preceding month's income credited to plaintiff's trust account. 27 28 These payments will be forwarded by the appropriate agency to the Clerk of the Court each time

the amount in plaintiff's account exceeds \$10.00, until the filing fee is paid in full. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2).

The court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1),(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 when it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327. The critical inquiry is whether a constitutional claim, however inartfully pleaded, has an arguable legal and factual basis. See Jackson v. Arizona, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1989), superseded by statute as stated in Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130-31 (9th Cir. 2000) ("[A] judge may dismiss [in forma pauperis] claims which are based on indisputably meritless legal theories or whose factual contentions are clearly baseless."); Franklin, 745 F.2d at 1227.

Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure "requires only 'a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,' in order to 'give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." <u>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</u>, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). In order to survive dismissal for failure to state a claim, a complaint must contain more than "a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action;" it must contain factual allegations sufficient "to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." <u>Id.</u> at 555. However, "[s]pecific facts are not necessary; the statement [of facts] need only 'give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." <u>Erickson v. Pardus</u>, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007) (quoting Bell Atlantic, 550 U.S. at 555, citations and internal quotations marks omitted). In reviewing a complaint under this standard, the court must accept as true the allegations of the

complaint in question, <u>Erickson</u>, 551 U.S. at 93, and construe the pleading in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. <u>Scheuer v. Rhodes</u>, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974), <u>overruled on other grounds</u>, <u>Davis v. Scherer</u>, 468 U.S. 183 (1984).

The only named defendant is Correctional Officer Roberts. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Roberts denied him breakfast and lunch in retaliation for plaintiff filing a grievance against him. As relief, plaintiff requests to be reimbursed for breakfast and lunch, and for defendant Roberts to be counseled.

Plaintiff has stated a potentially colorable retaliation claim against defendant Roberts. However, the complaint is dismissed with leave to amend based on the relief plaintiff is seeking. First, the court cannot order that a correctional officer receive counseling as relief in a civil rights action. Second, the type of reimbursement plaintiff is requesting is not clear. If plaintiff is requesting that he be awarded money damages for not receiving his breakfast and lunch, he shall clarify this in an amended complaint. Plaintiff shall also clarify the amount of money damages he is seeking.

If plaintiff chooses to amend the complaint, plaintiff must demonstrate how the conditions about which he complains resulted in a deprivation of plaintiff's constitutional rights. Rizzo v. Goode, 423 U.S. 362, 371 (1976). Also, the complaint must allege in specific terms how each named defendant is involved. Id. There can be no liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 unless there is some affirmative link or connection between a defendant's actions and the claimed deprivation.

Id.; May v. Enomoto, 633 F.2d 164, 167 (9th Cir. 1980); Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978). Furthermore, vague and conclusory allegations of official participation in civil rights violations are not sufficient. Ivey v. Bd. of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982).

In addition, plaintiff is informed that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to make plaintiff's amended complaint complete. Local Rule 220 requires that an amended complaint be complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading. This requirement exists because, as a general rule, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint. See Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). Once plaintiff files an amended complaint, the original pleading no longer serves any function in the case. Therefore, in an amended complaint, as in an

1 original complaint, each claim and the involvement of each defendant must be sufficiently 2 alleged. 3 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiff's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is granted. 4 5 2. Plaintiff is obligated to pay the statutory filing fee of \$350.00 for this action. Plaintiff 6 is assessed an initial partial filing fee in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. 7 § 1915(b)(1). All fees shall be collected and paid in accordance with this court's order to the 8 Director of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation filed concurrently 9 herewith. 10 3. Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed. 11 4. Within thirty days from the date of this order, plaintiff shall complete the attached 12 Notice of Amendment and submit the following documents to the court: 13 a. The completed Notice of Amendment; and 14 b. An original and one copy of the Amended Complaint. 15 Plaintiff's amended complaint shall comply with the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, the 16 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules of Practice. The amended complaint must 17 also bear the docket number assigned to this case and must be labeled "Amended Complaint." 18 Failure to file an amended complaint in accordance with this order may result in the 19 dismissal of this action. 20 Dated: May 19, 2017 21 22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 23 Can70.14 24 25 26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	RONALD LEE CANADA,	No. 2:17-cv-0070 KJN P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	NOTICE OF AMENDMENT
14	MACOMBER, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff hereby submits the following document in compliance with the court's order	
18	filed	
19	DATED:	Amended Complaint
20		
21		Plaintiff
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		