

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  
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
For the Northern District of CaliforniaUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
Northern District of California  
San Francisco Division

KENNETH E. CASTLE,

No. C 13-2089 LB

Plaintiff,

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

v.

J. A. SORES; et al.,

Defendants.

---

Kenneth E. Castle, a prisoner at the Correctional Training Facility in Soledad, filed this *pro se* prisoner's civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court reviewed the complaint and dismissed it with leave to file an amended complaint no later than June 28, 2013. ECF No. 10 at 4. The court explained that the complaint did not state a claim upon which relief could be granted and that Castle had to do more than merely submit a pile of exhibits that pertained to his problems.

Castle's attachment of numerous documents relating to his fall and medical problems indicate that he may want to complain about the fall or medical care, but the text of the complaint does not provide enough details for the court to determine whether any of Castle's constitutional rights may have been violated and whether [a] defendant may be liable. The court will not read through exhibits to attempt to piece together a claim for a plaintiff. It is a plaintiff's duty to provide a statement that is a complete statement of his claims against each of the defendants.

ECF No. 10 at 3. To guide Castle in his preparation of an amended complaint, the court described the elements necessary for Eighth Amendment claims about dangerous conditions and medical care,

1 as well as the need to link individual defendants to the claims. *See id.* at 3-4.

2 Castle did not file an amended complaint, and the deadline by which to do so has passed. He did  
3 send two letters to the court after the issuance of the Order Of Dismissal With Leave To Amend.  
4 The first letter states that the court already has his documents. ECF No. 13. The second letter  
5 resubmits some exhibits that had been attached to the complaint. ECF No. 14. Even liberally  
6 construing the letters to be an amended complaint, Castle fails to state a claim upon which relief may  
7 be granted. The two letters do not cure the deficiencies identified in the Order Of Dismissal With  
8 Leave To Amend. That is, Castle does not allege a claim for deliberate indifference to his safety or  
9 medical needs, or any other violation of his constitutional rights. He also does not allege what any  
10 defendant did or failed to do that may have caused a violation of his constitutional rights. Further  
11 leave to amend will not be granted because it would be futile; the court has explained what Castle  
12 needed to do to allege a claim and he was unable to do so.

13 This action is dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The  
14 dismissal of this action is without prejudice to Castle filing an action in state court to pursue any  
15 state law claims he may have. The clerk shall close the file.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 Dated: July 11, 2013

18   
\_\_\_\_\_  
LAUREL BEELER  
United States Magistrate Judge

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28