Northern District of California

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

ANTOINE L. ARDDS,

Plaintiff.

v.

M. PIZANO, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-00686-JCS (PR)

ORDER OF SERVICE;

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

INSTRUCTIONS TO CLERK

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff, a California state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this federal civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in which he raises claims against prison guards at Salinas Valley State Prison.

The third amended complaint (Dkt. No. 26) states cognizable claims. Therefore, in response to the operative complaint, defendants are directed to file a dispositive motion or notice regarding such motion on or before **August 7, 2017**, unless an extension is granted. The Court further directs that defendants adhere to the notice provisions detailed in Sections 2.a and 10 of the conclusion of this order.

DISCUSSION

Standard of Review Α.

In its initial review of this pro se complaint, this Court must dismiss any claim that is frivolous or malicious, or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C.

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

§ 1915(e). Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed. See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988).

A "complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). "A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." *Id.* (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 556). Furthermore, a court "is not required to accept legal conclusions cast in the form of factual allegations if those conclusions cannot reasonably be drawn from the facts alleged." Clegg v. Cult Awareness Network, 18 F.3d 752, 754-55 (9th Cir. 1994).

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

Legal Claims В.

Plaintiff alleges that in October 2014, Salinas Valley prison guard M. Pizano sprayed a dose of pepper spray into plaintiff's "bag of beans" during a cell search in retaliation for complaining about prison staff conduct. Plaintiff, who did not know of Pizano's act, later ate the contaminated beans, which resulted in injury to him. When liberally construed, this states cognizable First and Eighth Amendment claims.

Plaintiff did not see Pizano's alleged act. He bases his allegations on "information and belief" that two prison porters observed Pizano. Allegations based merely on "information and belief" may be sufficient to state a claim. However, in order for his claim to survive summary judgment, plaintiff will have to obtain evidentiary support for his allegations.

Plaintiff also alleges Salinas Valley prison guards J. Lopez, E. Medina, and C.

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

Martella failed to respond to his grievance about M. Pizano. When liberally construed, these allegations state cognizable claims for retaliation and failure to protect.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court orders as follows:

- The Clerk of the Court shall issue summons and a Magistrate Judge 1. jurisdiction consent form and the United States Marshal shall serve these forms, without prepayment of fees, along with a copy of the operative complaint in this matter (Docket No. 26), all attachments thereto, and a copy of this order upon M. Pizano, J. Lopez, E. Medina, and C. Martella at Salinas Valley State Prison. The Clerk shall also mail courtesy copies of the complaint and this order to the California Attorney General's Office.
- 2. On or before **August 7, 2017**, 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.
- If defendants elects to file a motion to dismiss on the grounds plaintiff a. failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), defendants shall do so in a motion for summary judgment, as required by Albino v. Baca, 747 F.3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2014).
- 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.
- 3. Plaintiff's opposition to the dispositive motion shall be filed with the Court and served on defendants no later than forty-five (45) days from the date defendants' motion is filed.
- Defendants shall file a reply brief no later than fifteen (15) days after 4. plaintiff's opposition is filed.

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

- 5. The motion shall be deemed submitted as of the date the reply brief is due. No hearing will be held on the motion unless the Court so orders at a later date.
- 6. All communications by the plaintiff with the Court must be served on defendants, or defendants' counsel once counsel has been designated, by mailing a true copy of the document to defendants or defendants' counsel.
- 7. Discovery may be taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. No further court order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(a)(2) or Local Rule 16-1 is required before the parties may conduct discovery.
- 8. It is plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the Court informed of any change of address and must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).
- 9. Extensions of time must be filed no later than the deadline sought to be extended and must be accompanied by a showing of good cause.
- 10. A decision from the Ninth Circuit requires that pro se prisoner-plaintiffs be given "notice of what is required of them in order to oppose" summary judgment motions at the time of filing of the motions, rather than when the court orders service of process or otherwise before the motions are filed. Woods v. Carey, 684 F.3d 934, 939–41 (9th Cir. 2012). Defendants shall provide the following notice to plaintiff when they file and serve any motion for summary judgment:

The defendants have made a motion for summary judgment by which they seek 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

United States District Court Northern District of California

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 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.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 28, 2017

JOSEPH C. SPERO Chief Magistrate Judge

1		
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
6		
7	ANTOINE L. ARDDS,	Case No. <u>15-cv-00686-JCS</u>
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
10	M. PIZANO, et al.,	
11	Defendants.	
12	I the various and beauty continued to	one on amplement in the Office of the Clark II C
13	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.	
14	That on April 28, 2017, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing	
15	said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope address depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by	ssed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery
16	receptacle located in the Clerk's office.	
17	Antoine L. Ardds ID: ID: P-59915	
18	California Health Care Facility, Stockton P.O. Box 32050	
19	Stockton, CA 95213	
20		
21	Dated: April 28, 2017	
22		
23		Susan Y. Soong Clerk, United States District Court
24		V I II.
25		By: Karen Hom, Deputy Clerk to the
26		Honorable JOSEPH C. SPERO
27		