

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAVICTOR WAYNE COOPER,
Plaintiff,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.Case No. [15-cv-05800-JSW](#)**SCREENING ORDER AND ORDER
SETTING CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE**

Re: Docket No. 4

Plaintiff, an inmate at the California Institution for Men, originally filed his Complaint in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco, through counsel. On December 17, 2015, Defendants removed the action to this Court, filed a waiver of reply, and a request for screening. (Docket Nos. 1, 4.) Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The Court must identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint “is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted,” or “seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.” *Id.* § 1915A(b).

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.” “Specific facts are not necessary; the statement need only give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007) (citations and internal quotations omitted). Although in order to state a claim a plaintiff “does not need detailed factual allegations, . . . a plaintiff’s obligation to provide the grounds of his entitle[ment] to relief requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.

1 ... Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Bell*
2 *Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citations and internal quotations omitted). A
3 complaint must proffer “enough facts to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* at
4 570.

5 In his Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that he is a kosher-observant Jew. (Compl. ¶¶ 1, 22-23.)
6 In or about November 2003, Plaintiff and the CDCR entered into a settlement agreement, whereby
7 the CDCR agreed to provide kosher meals so long as he was housed by CDCR and, if he was
8 “transferred, relocated or removed to another prison within the [CDCR] kosher meals would be
9 provided.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 1, 29, Ex. A.) Plaintiff alleges that he was transferred to the California
10 Institution for Men but, despite “numerous administrative requests and requests by his counsel”
11 has not been provided with kosher meals. (*Id.* ¶ 1, 30-32.) Plaintiff also alleges that after he
12 demanded to be provided kosher meals, he was denied a hearing before the Board of Prison Terms
13 relating to the possibility of early release. (*Id.* ¶¶ 63-68.) Plaintiff alleges that the CDCR and the
14 other named Defendants engaged in retaliation and violated his first amendment rights, and he
15 seeks relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983. He also alleges that Defendants actions violated
16 the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act, 42 U.S.C. section 2000CC
17 (“RLUIPA”). Finally, he asserts a state law claim for breach of contract based on an alleged
18 breach of the provisions of the settlement agreement.

19 When the Court construes these claims liberally, it concludes that the case survives this
20 screening Order, and Defendants should answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint by no later
21 than February 17, 2016. The parties shall appear for an initial case management conference on
22 March 18, 2016, and they shall file a joint case management statement by no later than March 11,
23 2016.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: January 20, 2016

26 
27 _____
28 JEFFREY S. WHITE
United States District Judge