

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  
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CORNELIUS LOPES,

No. C-08-4433 MMC

Plaintiff ,

**ORDER DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S  
COMPLAINT WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**

v.

CITY OF LIVERMORE, et al.,

Defendants.

Before the Court are plaintiff's complaint and application to proceed in forma pauperis, both filed September 23, 2008. When a party seeks to proceed in forma pauperis, the district court is required to dismiss the case if the court determines the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

Here, plaintiff's complaint fails to allege his constitutional rights were violated pursuant to an official policy, practice, or custom of defendants, and, consequently, the complaint fails to state a claim. See Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs., 436 U.S. 658, 690 (1978); Christie v. Iopa, 176 F.3d 1231, 1235 (9th Cir. 1999) ("Congress intended to hold municipalities liable only when 'action pursuant to official municipal policy of some nature caused a constitutional tort.'") (quoting Monell, 436 U.S. at 691).

Accordingly, plaintiff's complaint is hereby DISMISSED, with leave to file, no later

1 than October 31, 2008, a First Amended Complaint curing the deficiencies noted. If plaintiff  
2 does not file a First Amended Complaint by the required date, the Court will dismiss the  
3 action.

4 The Court will defer ruling on plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis  
5 pending plaintiff's filing of a First Amended Complaint, if any.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7  
8 Dated: September 29, 2008

  
MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
United States District Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28