

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
EUREKA DIVISION

VANCE LAVELL BOLDEN,  
Plaintiff,

No. C 15-0986 NJV (PR)

v.

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH  
LEAVE TO AMEND**

J. HOWLIN, et. al.,  
Defendants.

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. (Doc. 3.)

**DISCUSSION**

**A. Standard of Review**

Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review the court must identify any cognizable claims, and dismiss any claims which are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *Id.* at 1915A(b)(1),(2). Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed. *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." "Specific facts are not necessary; the statement need only "give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests."" *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007) (citations omitted). Although in order to state a claim a complaint "does not need detailed factual

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1 allegations, . . . a plaintiff's obligation to provide the 'grounds' of his 'entitle[ment] to relief'  
2 requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a  
3 cause of action will not do. . . . Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief  
4 above the speculative level." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)  
5 (citations omitted). A complaint must proffer "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is  
6 plausible on its face." *Id.* at 570. The United States Supreme Court has recently explained  
7 the "plausible on its face" standard of *Twombly*: "While legal conclusions can provide the  
8 framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations. When there are  
9 well-pleaded factual allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine  
10 whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662,  
11 679 (2009).

12 To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential  
13 elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was  
14 violated, and (2) that the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under the  
15 color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

16 **B. Legal Claims**

17 Plaintiff alleges that he was denied proper mental health care.

18 Deliberate indifference to serious medical needs violates the Eighth Amendment's  
19 proscription against cruel and unusual punishment. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104  
20 (1976); *McGuckin v. Smith*, 974 F.2d 1050, 1059 (9th Cir. 1992), *overruled on other*  
21 *grounds, WMX Technologies, Inc. v. Miller*, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc).  
22 A determination of "deliberate indifference" involves an examination of two elements: the  
23 seriousness of the prisoner's medical need and the nature of the defendant's response to  
24 that need. *Id.* at 1059.

25 A "serious" medical need exists if the failure to treat a prisoner's condition could  
26 result in further significant injury or the "unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain." *Id.* The  
27 existence of an injury that a reasonable doctor or patient would find important and worthy of  
28

1 comment or treatment; the presence of a medical condition that significantly affects an  
2 individual's daily activities; or the existence of chronic and substantial pain are examples of  
3 indications that a prisoner has a "serious" need for medical treatment. *Id.* at 1059-60.

4 A prison official is deliberately indifferent if he or she knows that a prisoner faces a  
5 substantial risk of serious harm and disregards that risk by failing to take reasonable steps  
6 to abate it. *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994). The prison official must not only  
7 "be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious  
8 harm exists," but he "must also draw the inference." *Id.* If a prison official should have  
9 been aware of the risk, but was not, then the official has not violated the Eighth  
10 Amendment, no matter how severe the risk. *Gibson v. County of Washoe*, 290 F.3d 1175,  
11 1188 (9th Cir. 2002). "A difference of opinion between a prisoner-patient and prison  
12 medical authorities regarding treatment does not give rise to a § 1983 claim." *Franklin v.*  
13 *Oregon*, 662 F.2d 1337, 1344 (9th Cir. 1981).

14 Plaintiff names as defendants CDCR mental health officials. Plaintiff claims that  
15 defendants have denied him relief, which has adversely affected his mental health, causing  
16 severe anxiety and hallucinations. This is a result of him anticipating having a cell mate.  
17 However, plaintiff fails to describe the mental health care that was denied or the specific  
18 actions of any individual defendant. For relief plaintiff seeks an injunction for a permanent  
19 single cell. The complaint will be dismissed with leave to amend. Plaintiff must describe  
20 the mental health care that was denied and identify specific defendants and describe how  
21 they violated his constitutional rights. Simply attaching exhibits is insufficient.

## 22 CONCLUSION

23 1. The complaint is **DISMISSED** with leave to amend in accordance with the  
24 standards set forth above. The amended complaint must be filed within **twenty-eight (28)**  
25 **days** of the date this order is filed and must include the caption and civil case number used  
26 in this order and the words AMENDED COMPLAINT on the first page. Because an  
27 amended complaint completely replaces the original complaint, plaintiff must include in it all  
28

1 the claims he wishes to present. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1262 (9th Cir.  
2 1992). He may not incorporate material from the original complaint by reference. Failure to  
3 amend within the designated time will result in the dismissal of this action.

4 2. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the  
5 court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper with the clerk headed  
6 "Notice of Change of Address," and must comply with the court's orders in a timely fashion.  
7 Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to  
8 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: March 9, 2015.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NANDOR J. VADAS  
United States Magistrate Judge

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
EUREKA DIVISION

VANCE LAVELL BOLDEN,

No. 1:15-CV-0986 NJV

Plaintiff,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

v.

J. HOWLIN, et al.,

Defendants.

---

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that on March 9, 2015, I SERVED a true and correct copy of the attached, by placing said copy in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) listed below, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail.

Vance Lavell Bolden  
T-18891  
C.T.F. Central  
B-Wing, 305 Low  
P.O. 689  
Soledad, CA 93960-0689

*/s/ Linn Van Meter*

---

Linn Van Meter  
Administrative Law Clerk to  
the Honorable Nandor J. Vadas