| 1  |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  |  |  |
| 3  |  |  |
| 4  |  |  |
| 5  |  |  |
| 6  |  |  |
| 7  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |  |
| 8  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |  |
| 9  |  |  |
| 10 | JUANITA MACHADO,   | No. 2:17-cv-02430 TLN CKD (PS)                 |
| 11 | Plaintiff,   |  |
| 12 | V.   | ORDER  |
| 13 | J. A. LIZARRAGA,   |  |
| 14 | Defendant.   |  |
| 15 |  |  |
| 16 | Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. The matter was referred to a United States                        |  |
| 17 | Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c).  |  |
| 18 | On January 22, 2018, the undersigned filed findings and a recommendation that this action                        |  |
| 19 | be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Plaintiff has filed objections seeking leave to amend in                  |  |
| 20 | order to attempt to state a federal claim. (ECF No. 10.) Leave to amend should be granted if it                  |  |
| 21 | appears possible that the defects in the complaint could be corrected, especially if a plaintiff is pro          |  |
| 22 | se. <u>Id.</u> at 1130-31; <u>see also Cato v. United States</u> , 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995) ("A pro se |  |
| 23 | litigant must be given leave to amend his or her complaint, and some notice of its deficiencies,                 |  |
| 24 | unless it is absolutely clear that the deficiencies of the complaint could not be cured by                       |  |
| 25 | amendment.") (citing Noll v. Carlson, 809 F.2d 1446, 1448 (9th Cir. 1987)). Here, plaintiff will                 |  |
| 26 | be granted an opportunity to amend the complaint in an attempt to allege a federal claim.                        |  |
| 27 | If plaintiff chooses to amend the complaint, plaintiff must set forth the jurisdictional                         |  |
| 28 | grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction of   | depends. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). |
|    |  | 1  |

| 1  | Further, plaintiff must demonstrate how the conduct complained of has resulted in a deprivation |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | of plaintiff's rights. See Ellis v. Cassidy, 625 F.2d 227 (9th Cir. 1980).                      |  |
| 3  | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:   |  |
| 4  | 1. The January 22, 2018 findings and recommendations are partially vacated, specifically        |  |
| 5  | the recommendation that this action be dismissed; and   |  |
| 6  | 2. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of service of this order to file an amended   |  |
| 7  | complaint that complies with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the  |  |
| 8  | Local Rules of Practice; the amended complaint must bear the docket number assigned this case   |  |
| 9  | and must be labeled "Amended Complaint"; failure to file an amended complaint in accordance     |  |
| 10 | with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed.                  |  |
| 11 | Dated: March 6, 2018 Carop U. Delany  |  |
| 12 | CAROLYN K. DELANEY  |  |
| 13 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  |  |
| 14 |   |  |
| 15 |   |  |
| 16 | 2/machado2430.amend   |  |
| 17 |   |  |
| 18 |   |  |
| 19 |   |  |
| 20 |   |  |
| 21 |   |  |
| 22 |   |  |
| 23 |   |  |
| 24 |   |  |
| 25 |   |  |
| 26 |   |  |
| 27 |   |  |
| 28 |   |  |
|    | 2   |  |