

\*E-Filed 12/10/13\*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

JUAN ANGEL MARTINEZ, JR.,

No. C 13-0556 RS (PR)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER OF SERVICE;**

v.

**ORDER DIRECTING DEFENDANTS  
TO FILE DISPOSITIVE MOTION OR  
NOTICE REGARDING SUCH  
MOTION;**

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,

Defendants.

**INSTRUCTIONS TO CLERK****INTRODUCTION**

This is a federal civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a *pro se* state prisoner. Defendants are directed to file a dispositive motion or notice regarding such motion on or before March 16, 2014, unless an extension is granted. **The Court further directs that defendants are to adhere to the new notice provisions detailed in Sections 2.a and 10 of the conclusion of this order.**

**DISCUSSION****A. Standard of Review**

A federal court must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the court must identify any cognizable claims and

No. C 13-0566 RS (PR)  
ORDER OF SERVICE

1 dismiss any claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may  
2 be granted or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See id.*  
3 § 1915A(b)(1),(2). *Pro se* pleadings must be liberally construed. *See Balistreri v. Pacifica*  
4 *Police Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988).

5 A “complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim  
6 to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009)  
7 (quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). “A claim has facial  
8 plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the  
9 reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* (quoting  
10 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). Furthermore, a court “is not required to accept legal conclusions  
11 cast in the form of factual allegations if those conclusions cannot reasonably be drawn from  
12 the facts alleged.” *Clegg v. Cult Awareness Network*, 18 F.3d 752, 754–55 (9th Cir. 1994).  
13 To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements:  
14 (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and  
15 (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law.  
16 *See West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

17 **B. Legal Claims**

18 Plaintiff alleges that his detention in the Secured Housing Unit at Pelican Bay State  
19 Prison violates his (1) First, (2) Eighth, and (3) Fourteenth Amendment rights. Liberally  
20 construed, these claims are cognizable under § 1983. He names as defendants (1) Governor  
21 Edmund G. Brown, (2) Matthew Cate, director of the California Department of Corrections  
22 and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”), (3) Anthony Chaus, Chief of the CDCR’s Office of  
23 Correctional Safety, (4) Pelican Bay Wardens G.D. Lewis, P.T. Smith, and D. Bradbury,  
24 (5) Pelican Bay Correctional Officers D. Jacquez, K. Getz, M. Townsend, K.L. McGuyer,  
25 J. McMillan, and S. Burris, (6) CDCR Appeals Examiners K.J. Allen and D. Foston,  
26 (7) M. Beuchner, an agent for the CDCR’s Special Services Unit, and (8) A. Quinones and  
27 W. Shaw, CDCR gang investigators at Corcoran State Prison.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court orders as follows:

1. The Clerk of the Court shall issue summons and the United States Marshal shall serve, without prepayment of fees, a copy of the complaint in this matter, all attachments thereto, and a copy of this order upon (1) Governor Edmund G. Brown, (2) Matthew Cate, director of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”), (3) Anthony Chaus, Chief of the CDCR’s Office of Correctional Safety, (4) Pelican Bay Wardens G.D. Lewis, P.T. Smith, and D. Bradbury, (5) Pelican Bay Correctional Officers D. Jacquez, K. Getz, M. Townsend, K.L. McGuyer, J. McMillan, and S. Burris, (6) CDCR Appeals Examiners K.J. Allen and D. Foston, (7) M. Beuchner, an agent for the CDCR’s Special Services Unit, and (8) A. Quinones and W. Shaw, CDCR gang investigators at Corcoran State Prison. The Clerk shall also mail courtesy copies of the complaint and this order to the California Attorney General’s Office.

2. No later than ninety (90) days from the date of this order, defendants shall file a motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion with respect to the claims in the complaint found to be cognizable above.

a. If defendants elect to file a motion to dismiss on the grounds plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), defendants shall do so in an unenumerated Rule 12(b) motion pursuant to *Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315 F.3d 1108, 1119–20 (9th Cir. 2003), cert. denied *Alameida v. Terhune*, 540 U.S. 810 (2003).

b. Any motion for summary judgment shall be supported by adequate factual documentation and shall conform in all respects to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendants are advised that summary judgment cannot be granted, nor qualified immunity found, if material facts are in dispute. If any defendant is of the opinion that this case cannot be resolved by summary judgment, he shall so inform the Court prior to the date the summary judgment motion is due.

1           3.       Plaintiff's opposition to the dispositive motion shall be filed with the Court and  
2 served on defendants no later than forty-five (45) days from the date defendants' motion is  
3 filed.

4               a.       In the event the defendants file an unenumerated motion to dismiss  
5 under Rule 12(b), plaintiff is hereby cautioned as follows:

6               The defendants have made a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b) of the  
7 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on the ground you have not exhausted your administrative  
8 remedies. The motion will, if granted, result in the dismissal of your case. When a party you  
9 are suing makes a motion to dismiss for failure to exhaust, and that motion is properly  
10 supported by declarations (or other sworn testimony) and/or documents, you may not simply  
11 rely on what your complaint says. Instead, you must set out specific facts in declarations,  
12 depositions, answers to interrogatories, or documents, that contradict the facts shown in the  
13 defendant's declarations and documents and show that you have in fact exhausted your  
14 claims. If you do not submit your own evidence in opposition, the motion to dismiss, if  
15 appropriate, may be granted and the case dismissed.

16           4.       Defendants shall file a reply brief no later than fifteen (15) days after  
17 plaintiff's opposition is filed.

18           5.       The motion shall be deemed submitted as of the date the reply brief is due. No  
19 hearing will be held on the motion unless the Court so orders at a later date.

20           6.       All communications by the plaintiff with the Court must be served on  
21 defendants, or defendants' counsel once counsel has been designated, by mailing a true copy  
22 of the document to defendants or defendants' counsel.

23           7.       Discovery may be taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil  
24 Procedure. No further court order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(a)(2) or Local  
25 Rule 16-1 is required before the parties may conduct discovery.

26           8.       It is plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the  
27 court informed of any change of address and must comply with the court's orders in a timely  
28

1 fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute  
2 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

3 9. Extensions of time must be filed no later than the deadline sought to be  
4 extended and must be accompanied by a showing of good cause.

5 10. A recent decision from the Ninth Circuit requires that *pro se* prisoner-plaintiffs  
6 be given “notice of what is required of them in order to oppose” summary judgment motions  
7 at the time of filing of the motions, rather than when the court orders service of process or  
8 otherwise before the motions are filed. *Woods v. Carey*, No. 09-15548, slip op. 7871, 7874  
9 (9th Cir. July 6, 2012). **Defendants shall provide the following notice to plaintiff when**  
10 **they file and serve any motion for summary judgment:**

11 The defendants have made a motion for summary judgment by which they seek  
12 to have your case dismissed. A motion for summary judgment under Rule 56  
of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will, if granted, end your case.

13 Rule 56 tells you what you must do in order to oppose a motion for summary  
14 judgment. Generally, summary judgment must be granted when there is no  
15 genuine issue of material fact — that is, if there is no real dispute about any  
16 fact that would affect the result of your case, the party who asked for summary  
17 judgment is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, which will end your case.  
18 When a party you are suing makes a motion for summary judgment that is  
19 properly supported by declarations (or other sworn testimony), you cannot  
20 simply rely on what your complaint says. Instead, you must set out specific  
facts in declarations, depositions, answers to interrogatories, or authenticated  
documents, as provided in Rule 56(e), that contradict the facts shown in the  
defendants’ declarations and documents and show that there is a genuine issue  
of material fact for trial. If you do not submit your own evidence in opposition,  
summary judgment, if appropriate, may be entered against you. If summary  
judgment is granted, your case will be dismissed and there will be no trial.

21 *Rand v. Rowland*, 154 F.3d 952, 962–63 (9th Cir. 1998).

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 DATED: December 10, 2013

  
RICHARD SEEBORG  
United States District Judge