1			
2			
3			
4	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
6			
7	WINSTON WILLIAMS,	Case No. <u>17-cv-0098-TEH</u>	
8	Plaintiff,		
9	v.	ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH LEAVE TO AMEND	
10	WILLIAM MUNIZ, et. al.,		
11	Defendants.		
12			
13	Plaintiff, an inmate at Sal	inas Valley State Prison, filed	
14	this <u>pro</u> <u>se</u> civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The		
15	original complaint was dismissed with leave to amend and		
16	Plaintiff has filed an amended complaint.		
17	I		
18	Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of		
19	cases in which prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity		
20	or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. §		

United States District Court Northern District of California

The Court must identify cognizable claims or dismiss 21 1915A(a). 22 the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint 23 "is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted," or "seeks monetary relief from a 24 defendant who is immune from such relief." Id. § 1915A(b). 25 Pleadings filed by pro se litigants, however, must be liberally 26 27 Hebbe v. Pliler, 627 F.3d 338, 342 (9th Cir. 2010); construed. 28 Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't., 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir.

Dockets.Justia.com

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

28

1990).

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. West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). II

Plaintiff states that he has received inadequate medical care.

Deliberate indifference to serious medical needs violates the Eighth Amendment's proscription against cruel and unusual punishment. Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976); McGuckin v. Smith, 974 F.2d 1050, 1059 (9th Cir. 1992), overruled on other grounds, WMX Technologies, Inc. v. Miller, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc). A determination of "deliberate indifference" involves an examination of two elements: the 16 seriousness of the prisoner's medical need and the nature of the defendant's response to that need. Id. at 1059.

19 A "serious" medical need exists if the failure to treat a 20 prisoner's condition could result in further significant injury or the "unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain." 21 Id. The 22 existence of an injury that a reasonable doctor or patient would 23 find important and worthy of comment or treatment; the presence 24 of a medical condition that significantly affects an individual's 25 daily activities; or the existence of chronic and substantial 26 pain are examples of indications that a prisoner has a "serious" 27 need for medical treatment. Id. at 1059-60.

2

Northern District of California United States District Court

A prison official is deliberately indifferent if he or she 1 2 knows that a prisoner faces a substantial risk of serious harm and disregards that risk by failing to take reasonable steps to 3 4 Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994). abate it. The 5 prison official must not only "be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists," but he "must also draw the inference." Id. If a prison official should have been aware of the risk, but was not, then the official has not violated the Eighth Amendment, no matter how severe the risk. Gibson v. County of Washoe, 290 F.3d 1175, 1188 (9th Cir. 2002). "A difference of opinion between a prisonerpatient and prison medical authorities regarding treatment does not give rise to a § 1983 claim." Franklin v. Oregon, 662 F.2d 1337, 1344 (9th Cir. 1981).

Plaintiff states that Defendants failed to provide adequate treatment for his serious medical needs. He seeks money damages and injunctive relief. Plaintiff states that he suffers from 18 constant pain regarding his shoulder; however, he provides no 19 more information. It is not clear the nature of his injury or 20 medical problem, nor does he describe the treatment that is needed which has been denied. Plaintiff states he was denied 21 medical care on February 14, 2016, but he fails to describe the 22 23 care that was denied. In order to obtain injunctive relief, 24 Plaintiff must provide more information concerning the relief he 25 seeks. While he has set forth the basic elements of the claim he 26 has failed to provide sufficient factual allegations to support 27 Plaintiff's original complaint contained the same the claim. 28 deficiencies, and he was informed that he needed to provide more

3

information in an amended complaint. Unfortunately, the amended complaint is substantially similar to the original complaint and Plaintiff has failed to provide additional information.

A complaint must proffer "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). 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).

The amended complaint is dismissed with leave to amend to 14 15 provide more information. Plaintiff should describe the medical problems with his shoulder and the specific actions of each 16 Defendant that violated his constitutional rights. Plaintiff should describe what specific medical care was denied and how it violated his constitutional rights.

III

21 For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby orders as 22 follows:

23 1. Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint is DISMISSED WITH LEAVE TO FILE A Second AMENDED COMPLAINT, within twenty-eight 24 25 days containing all related claims against all Defendants that 26 Plaintiff wishes to proceed against in this action. The pleading 27 must be simple, concise and direct and must state clearly and 28 succinctly how each and every Defendant is alleged to have

Northern District of California United States District Court

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

4

violated Plaintiff's federally-protected rights. <u>See Leer</u>, 844 F.2d at 634. The pleading must include the caption and civil case number used in this order and the words COURT ORDERED Second AMENDED COMPLAINT on the first page. Plaintiff is advised that he must file all of his claims in one complaint and not present them piecemeal to the Court in various letters and other documents. Failure to file a proper Second Amended Complaint within twenty-eight days of this order will result in the dismissal of this case.

2. Plaintiff is advised that the First Amended Complaint will supersede the original Complaint and all other pleadings. Claims and defendants not included in the First Amended Complaint will not be considered by the Court. <u>See Lacey v. Maricopa</u> <u>County</u>, 693 F.3d 896 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc) ("For claims dismissed with prejudice and without leave to amend, we will not require that they be repled in a subsequent amended complaint to preserve them for appeal. But for any claims voluntarily dismissed, we will consider those claims to be waived if not repled.").

3. It is Plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this action. Plaintiff must keep the Court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper with the Clerk headed "Notice of Change of Address," and must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal

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

25

26

27

28

1	of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule		
2	of Civil Procedure 41(b).		
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
4	Dated: 5/11/2017		
5		Helle Hannen	
6		HELTON E. HENDERSON nited States District Judge	
7	G:\PRO-SE\TEH\CR.17\Williams0098.dwlta2.docx		
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