1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	KASEY F. HOFFMANN,	No. 2:17-cv-1761-JAM-EFB PS
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER AND FINDINGS AND
14	DEANNA BOVEE, et al.,	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C.	
18	§ 1983, has filed a request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. His application makes the	
19	required showing and is granted. However, the court must screen the complaint pursuant to 28	
20	U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). That section directs the court to dismiss a case at any time if the action is	
21	frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary	
22	relief against an immune defendant.	
23	Plaintiff brings this action against defendants Lassen Family Services, Deena Bovee, and	
24	Casey Simoni, alleging defendants violated his constitutional rights and provision of the Indian	
25	Child Welfare Act ("ICWA") when they terminated his custody rights over his biological son.	
26	ECF No. 1. Examination of the court's records reveals that plaintiff has already commenced an	
27	action against the same defendants over the same dispute. See Hoffman v. Lassen County, No.	
28	2:17-cv-1734-WBS-EFB P (E.D. Cal.), ECF No. 1 (Compl.). Therefore, this action is duplicative	
	1	

1	and should be dismissed. <sup>1</sup> See Barapind v. Reno, 72 F. Supp. 2d 1132, 1144 (E.D. Cal. 1999)	
2	(when a complaint involving the same parties and issues has already been filed in another federal	
3	district court, the court has discretion to abate or dismiss the second action).	
4	Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF	
5	No. 2) is granted.	
6	Further, it is hereby RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed as duplicative.	
7	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge	
8	assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days	
9	after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written	
10	objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned	
11	"Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file objections	
12	within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. <i>Turner v</i> .	
13	Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).	
14	Dated: August 23, 2018.	
15	Elmind F. Bieman	
16	EDMUND F. BRENNAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	<sup>1</sup> "Federal comity and judicial economy give rise to rules which allow a district court to transfer, stay, or dismiss an action when a similar complaint has already been filed in another	
27	federal court." <i>Id.</i> at 1145 (citation omitted). "[I]ncreasing calendar congestion in the federal courts makes it imperative to avoid concurrent litigation in more than one forum whenever	
28	consistent with the right of the parties." <i>Crawford v. Bell</i> , 599 F.2d 890, 893 (9th Cir. 1979).	