| /                                      | Plaint                 |
|--|------------------------|
| 8                                      | v.                     |
| 9                                      |                        |
| 10                                     | G. D. LEWIS, et al.,   |
| 11                                     | Defer                  |
|  |                        |
| . <b>g</b> 12                          |                        |
| strict of California<br>13<br>14<br>12 | Plaintiff, a sta       |
| of Ca                                  | Plaintiff's amended co |
| 15                                     | amended complaint.     |
| st                                     |                        |

16

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. 13-cv-03366-JD

**ORDER OF SERVICE** Re: Dkt. No. 17

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. ntiff's amended complaint was dismissed with leave to amend and he has filed a second nded complaint.

# DISCUSSION

#### I. **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

THOMAS GOOLSBY,

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

18 Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which prisoners seek 19 redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. 20 § 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 21 22 monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. Id. at 1915A(b)(1),(2). Pro se 23 pleadings must be liberally construed. Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). 24

25 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." Although a complaint "does not need detailed 26 factual allegations, ... a plaintiff's obligation to provide the 'grounds' of his 'entitle[ment] to 27 relief' requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a 28

cause of action will not do.... Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citations omitted). A complaint must proffer "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Id.* at 570. The United States Supreme Court has explained the "plausible on its face" standard of *Twombly*: "While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations. When there are well-pleaded factual allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009).

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

12 **II.** 

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

# LEGAL CLAIMS

Plaintiff presents many clams of retaliation following his transfer to Pelican Bay State Prison ("PBSP"). "Within the prison context, a viable claim of First Amendment retaliation entails five basic elements: (1) An assertion that a state actor took some adverse action against an inmate (2) because of (3) that prisoner's protected conduct, and that such action (4) chilled the inmate's exercise of his First Amendment rights, and (5) the action did not reasonably advance a legitimate correctional goal." *Rhodes v. Robinson*, 408 F.3d 559, 567-68 (9th Cir. 2005) (footnote omitted). *Accord Pratt v. Rowland*, 65 F.3d 802, 806 (9th Cir. 1995) (prisoner suing prison officials under § 1983 for retaliation must allege that he was retaliated against for exercising his constitutional rights and that the retaliatory action did not advance legitimate penological goals, such as preserving institutional order and discipline).

A prisoner must at minimum allege that he suffered harm, since harm that is more than
minimal will almost always have a chilling effect. *Rhodes*, 408 F.3d at 567-68 n.11; *see Gomez v. Vernon*, 255 F.3d 1118, 1127-28 (9th Cir. 2001) (prisoner alleged injury by claiming he had to
quit his law library job in the face of repeated threats by defendants to transfer him because of his
complaints about the administration of the library).

28

United States District Court Northern District of California

2

In the prior screening order, the Court noted that plaintiff had presented cognizable claims

of retaliation against defendants Mills, Barnts, and Soderlund, however his claim regarding denial of access to the courts was dismissed with leave to amend. Plaintiff has filed a second amended complaint but it does not contain a claim regarding access to the courts, therefore the case will continue against Mills, Barnts, and Soderlund for claims of retaliation.

Plaintiff has also sought to add Warden Lewis and Captain Puget as defendants with respect to the retaliation claims. Plaintiff states that Lewis and Puget participated and coordinated the retaliatory acts but provides no support for these allegations. He states that they recruited the other defendants to retaliate against plaintiff but this bare allegation is insufficient under *Iqbal*. Lewis and Puget are dismissed.

#### CONCLUSION

1. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Docket No. 17) is **GRANTED** and the Court has considered the second amended complaint.

2. The clerk shall issue a summons and the United States Marshal shall serve, without prepayment of fees, copies of the complaint with attachments and copies of this order on the following defendants at Pelican Bay State Prison: Litigation Coordinator William Barnts, Litigation Coordinator Soderlund, and Correctional Counselor (CCI) Mills. The remaining defendants are dismissed from this action.

18

3.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

In order to expedite the resolution of this case, the court orders as follows:

a. No later than sixty days from the date of service, defendant shall file a
motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion. The motion shall be supported by
adequate factual documentation and shall conform in all respects to Federal Rule of Civil
Procedure 56, and shall include as exhibits all records and incident reports stemming from the
events at issue. If defendant is of the opinion that this case cannot be resolved by summary
judgment, he shall so inform the court prior to the date his summary judgment motion is due. All
papers filed with the court shall be promptly served on the plaintiff.

b. At the time the dispositive motion is served, defendant shall also serve, on a
separate paper, the appropriate notice or notices required by *Rand v. Rowland*, 154 F.3d 952, 953954 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc), and *Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315 F.3d 1108, 1120 n. 4 (9th Cir. 2003).

See Woods v. Carey, 684 F.3d 934, 940-941 (9th Cir. 2012) (Rand and Wyatt notices must be given at the time motion for summary judgment or motion to dismiss for nonexhaustion is filed, not earlier); Rand at 960 (separate paper requirement).

Plaintiff's opposition to the dispositive motion, if any, shall be filed with c. the court and served upon defendant no later than thirty days from the date the motion was served upon him. Plaintiff must read the attached page headed "NOTICE -- WARNING," which is provided to him pursuant to Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 953-954 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc), and Klingele v. Eikenberry, 849 F.2d 409, 411-12 (9th Cir. 1988).

If defendant files a motion for summary judgment claiming that plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), plaintiff should take note of the attached page headed "NOTICE -- WARNING (EXHAUSTION)," which is provided to him as required by Wyatt v. Terhune, 315 F.3d 1108, 1120 n. 4 (9th Cir. 2003).

d. If defendant wishes to file a reply brief, he shall do so no later than fifteen days after the opposition is served upon him.

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

4. All communications by plaintiff with the court must be served on defendant, or

18 defendant's counsel once counsel has been designated, by mailing a true copy of the document to

defendants or defendants' counsel. 19

Discovery may be taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. 5. No further court order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(a)(2) is required before the parties may conduct discovery.

6. It is plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper with the clerk headed "Notice of 23 Change of Address." He also must comply with the court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to 24 do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). 26

Northern District of California United States District Court

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

25

27

28

| 1        | IT IS SO ORDERED.        |  |
|----------|--------------------------|--|
| 2        | Dated: November 20, 2014 | $\mathcal{A}$                                |
| 3        |                          |  |
| 4        |                          | JAMES DONATO<br>United states District Judge |
| 5        |                          |  |
| 6        |                          |  |
| 7        |                          |  |
| 8        |                          |  |
| 9        |                          |  |
| 10       |                          |  |
| 11       |                          |  |
| 12       |                          |  |
| 13       |                          |  |
| 14       |                          |  |
| 15       |                          |  |
| 16       |                          |  |
| 17       |                          |  |
| 18       |                          |  |
| 19<br>20 |                          |  |
| 20       |                          |  |
| 21       |                          |  |
| 22       |                          |  |
| 23<br>24 |                          |  |
| 24<br>25 |                          |  |
| 23<br>26 |                          |  |
| 20<br>27 |                          |  |
| 28       |                          |  |
|          |                          | 5  |

United States District Court Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

## NOTICE -- WARNING (SUMMARY JUDGMENT)

If defendants move for summary judgment, they are seeking 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.

Rule 56 tells you what you must do in order to oppose a motion for summary judgment. Generally, summary judgment must be granted when there is no genuine issue of material fact-that is, if there is no real dispute about any fact that would affect the result of your case, the party who asked for summary judgment is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, which will end your case. When a party you are suing makes a motion for summary judgment that is properly supported by declarations (or other sworn testimony), you cannot 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 defendant's 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.

#### **NOTICE -- WARNING (EXHAUSTION)**

If defendants file a motion for summary judgment for failure to exhaust, they are seeking to have your case dismissed. If the motion is granted it will end your case.

You have the right to present any evidence you may have which tends to show that you did
exhaust your administrative remedies. Such evidence may be in the form of declarations
(statements signed under penalty of perjury) or authenticated documents, that is, documents
accompanied by a declaration showing where they came from and why they are authentic, or other
sworn papers, such as answers to interrogatories or depositions.

If defendants file a motion for summary judgment for failure to exhaust and it is granted,
your case will be dismissed and there will be no trial.

27 28

| 1  |  |   |  |
|----|--|---|--|
| 2  |  |   |  |
| 3  |  |   |  |
| 4  | UNITED STATES  | S DISTRICT COURT  |  |
| 5  | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |   |  |
| 6  | THOMAS COOLSDV   |   |  |
| 7  | THOMAS GOOLSBY,<br>Plaintiff,  | Case No. <u>13-cv-03366-JD</u>                              |  |
| 8  | V.   | CEDTIFICATE OF CEDVICE                                      |  |
| 9  |  | CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE                                      |  |
| 10 | G. D. LEWIS, et al.,<br>Defendants.  |   |  |
| 11 | Derendants.  |   |  |
| 12 | I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S.  |   |  |
| 13 | District Court, Northern District of California.<br>That on 11/20/2014, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing<br>said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by<br>depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery<br>receptacle located in the Clerk's office. |   |  |
| 14 |  |   |  |
| 15 |  |   |  |
| 16 | receptacie located in the clerk's office.  |   |  |
| 17 | Thomas Goolsby<br>F-19778  |   |  |
| 18 | P.O. Box 7500<br>Crescent City, CA 95532   |   |  |
| 19 |  |   |  |
| 20 |  |   |  |
| 21 | Dated: 11/20/2014  |   |  |
| 22 |  | Richard W. Wieking  |  |
| 23 |  | Clerk, United States District Court                         |  |
| 24 |  |   |  |
| 25 |  | By Lin D Llad   |  |
| 26 |  | By: <b>fice R. Llork</b><br>LISA CLANN, Deputy Clark to the |  |
| 27 |  | Honorable JAMES DONATO                                      |  |
| 28 |  |   |  |

United States District Court Northern District of California