

1 **II. Screening Requirement and Standards**

2 Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which prisoners seek
3 redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C.
4 § 1915A(a). The court must identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion
5 of the complaint, if the complaint “is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which
6 relief may be granted,” or “seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such
7 relief.” *Id.* § 1915A(b).

8 A pro se plaintiff, like other litigants, must satisfy the pleading requirements of Rule 8(a)
9 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 8(a)(2) “requires a complaint to include a short and
10 plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, in order to give the
11 defendant fair notice of what the claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v.*
12 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 554, 562-563 (2007) (citing *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41 (1957)).
13 While the complaint must comply with the “short and plain statement” requirements of Rule 8,
14 its allegations must also include the specificity required by *Twombly* and *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556
15 U.S. 662, 679 (2009).

16 To avoid dismissal for failure to state a claim a complaint must contain more than “naked
17 assertions,” “labels and conclusions” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of
18 action.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555-557. In other words, “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of
19 a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements do not suffice.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at
20 678.

21 Furthermore, a claim upon which the court can grant relief must have facial plausibility.
22 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570. “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual
23 content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the
24 misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. When considering whether a complaint states a
25 claim upon which relief can be granted, the court must accept the allegations as true, *Erickson v.*
26 *Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007), and construe the complaint in the light most favorable to the
27 plaintiff, *see Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

28 ////

1 from damage actions for judicial acts taken within the jurisdiction of their courts). It is clear from
2 the complaint that plaintiff's claims are also barred by judicial immunity.

3 Furthermore, the court finds that granting plaintiff leave to amend her complaint would be
4 futile. It is therefore recommend that it be dismissed with prejudice. *See Hartmann v. CDCR*,
5 707 F.3d 1114, 1130 (9th Cir. 2013) ("A district court may deny leave to amend when
6 amendment would be futile.").

7 **IV. Order and Recommendation**

8 Accordingly, it is ORDERED that:

- 9 1. The July 28, 2017 findings and recommendations (ECF No. 7) are withdrawn.
- 10 2. Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 8) is granted.
- 11 3. Plaintiff shall pay the statutory filing fee of \$350. All payments shall be collected
12 by the Sheriff of Butte County in accordance with the notice to be filed
13 concurrently herewith.

14 Additionally, it is RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed with prejudice for
15 failure to a claim upon which relief can be granted.

16 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
17 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days
18 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
19 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned
20 "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file objections
21 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. *Turner v.*
22 *Duncan*, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

23 Dated: September 7, 2017.

24 
25 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27
28