

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 ALEXANDER DESEAN SAMMONS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 SPEARMAN, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:17-cv-1445 CKD P

ORDER

17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and seeking relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §
18 1983. This proceeding was referred to this court by Local Rule 302 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
19 636(b)(1) and plaintiff has consented to have all matters in this action before a United States
20 Magistrate Judge. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

21 Plaintiff requests leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Since plaintiff has submitted a
22 declaration that makes the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), his request will be granted.
23 Plaintiff is required to pay the statutory filing fee of \$350.00 for this action. 28 U.S.C. §§
24 1914(a), 1915(b)(1). By separate order, the court will direct the appropriate agency to collect the
25 initial partial filing fee from plaintiff's trust account and forward it to the Clerk of the Court.
26 Thereafter, plaintiff will be obligated for monthly payments of twenty percent of the preceding
27 month's income credited to plaintiff's prison trust account. These payments will be forwarded by

28 /////

1 the appropriate agency to the Clerk of the Court each time the amount in plaintiff's account
2 exceeds \$10.00, until the filing fee is paid in full. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2).

3 The court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a
4 governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The
5 court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally
6 "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek
7 monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1),(2).

8 A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.
9 Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227-28 (9th
10 Cir. 1984). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an
11 indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. Neitzke,
12 490 U.S. at 327. The critical inquiry is whether a constitutional claim, however inartfully
13 pleaded, has an arguable legal and factual basis. See Jackson v. Arizona, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9th
14 Cir. 1989); Franklin, 745 F.2d at 1227.

15 In order to avoid dismissal for failure to state a claim a complaint must contain more than
16 "naked assertions," "labels and conclusions" or "a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause
17 of action." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-557 (2007). In other words,
18 "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory
19 statements do not suffice." Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). Furthermore, a claim
20 upon which the court can grant relief has facial plausibility. Twombly, 550 U.S. at 570. "A
21 claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw
22 the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." Iqbal, 556 U.S.
23 at 678. When considering whether a complaint states a claim upon which relief can be granted,
24 the court must accept the allegations as true, Erickson v. Pardus, 127 S. Ct. 2197, 2200 (2007),
25 and construe the complaint in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, see Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416
26 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

27 In his complaint, plaintiff complains about the loss of personal property. The United
28 States Supreme Court has held that "an unauthorized intentional deprivation of property by a state

1 employee does not constitute a violation of the procedural requirements of the Due Process
2 Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment if a meaningful post-deprivation remedy for the loss is
3 available.” Hudson v. Palmer, 468 U.S. 517, 533 (1984). Thus, where the state provides a
4 meaningful post-deprivation remedy, only authorized, intentional deprivations constitute
5 actionable violations of the Due Process Clause. An authorized deprivation is one carried out
6 pursuant to established state procedures, regulations, or statutes. Piatt v. McDougall, 773 F.2d
7 1032, 1036 (9th Cir. 1985); see also Knudson v. City of Ellensburg, 832 F.2d 1142, 1149 (9th
8 Cir. 1987).

9 In the instant case, plaintiff has not alleged any facts which suggest that the deprivation
10 was authorized. The California Legislature has provided a remedy for tort claims against public
11 officials in the California Government Code, §§ 900, et seq. Since plaintiff has not attempted to
12 seek redress in the state system, he cannot sue in federal court on the claim that the state deprived
13 him of property without due process of the law. The court concludes that this claim must,
14 therefore, be dismissed as frivolous. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). However, plaintiff will be
15 granted an opportunity to amend to cure the deficiencies in his pleadings.

16 Plaintiff is informed that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to make
17 plaintiff’s amended complaint complete. Local Rule 220 requires that an amended complaint be
18 complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading. This is because, as a general rule, an
19 amended complaint supersedes the original complaint. See Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th
20 Cir. 1967). Once plaintiff files an amended complaint, the original pleading no longer serves any
21 function in the case. Therefore, in an amended complaint, as in an original complaint, each claim
22 and the involvement of each defendant must be sufficiently alleged.

23 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

24 1. Plaintiff’s request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is granted.

25 2. Plaintiff is obligated to pay the statutory filing fee of \$350.00 for this action. All fees
26 shall be collected and paid in accordance with this court’s order to the Director of the California
27 Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation filed concurrently herewith.

28 /////

1 3. Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed.

2 4. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of service of this order to file an amended
3 complaint that complies with the requirements of this order, the Civil Rights Act, the Federal
4 Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules of Practice. The amended complaint must bear the
5 docket number assigned this case and must be labeled "Amended Complaint." Failure to file an
6 amended complaint in accordance with this order will result in a recommendation that this action
7 be dismissed.

8 Dated: November 6, 2017



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 1
13 samm1445.14