

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 CALIFORNIA

DAVID C. LETTIERI,

Plaintiff,

v.

FACEBOOK, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-06554-HSG](#)**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

Plaintiff, a pretrial detainee incarcerated at Niagara County Jail, has filed a *pro se* action. His complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is now before the Court for review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in a separate order.

DISCUSSION**A. Standard of Review**

A federal court must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the court must identify any cognizable claims and dismiss any claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), (2). *Pro se* pleadings must, however, be liberally construed. *See United States v. Qazi*, 975 F.3d 989, 993 (9th Cir. 2020).

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.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). “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 omitted).

1 While Rule 8 does not require detailed factual allegations, it demands more than an unadorned,
2 the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677–78 (2009).
3 A pleading that offers only labels and conclusions, or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a
4 cause of action, or naked assertions devoid of further factual enhancement does not suffice. *Id.*

5 **B. Procedural History**

6 The complaint names as defendants the company Facebook, Facebook employee Tyler
7 Harmon, and Western District of New York Assistant United States Attorneys Paul E. Bonnano
8 and Maeve Eileen Huggins. The complaint makes the following allegations. In May 2023,
9 Plaintiff looked at the Facebook chat that Randall Garver claimed was for discovery. Plaintiff
10 demanded to see the other two to three week chats that the victim had claimed to have had with
11 Plaintiff. Mr. Garver and defendant Bonanno stated that they would get back to Plaintiff, but have
12 not gotten back to Plaintiff as of October 10, 2023. Accordingly, it is safe to say that defendant
13 Harmon lied and committed perjury, and that the chat violated Fed. R. Evid. 901, which governs
14 the authentication or identification of evidence. *See generally* Dkt. No. 1.

15 The Court DISMISSES this complaint for failure to state a cognizable claim for relief.
16 There is no private right of action under Fed. R. Evid. 901. *See, e.g., In re Baldwin-United Corp.*
17 *(Single Premium Deferred Annuities Ins. Litig.)*, 770 F.2d 328, 335 (2d Cir. 1985) (federal rules of
18 civil procedures are “rule[s] of procedure and create[] no substantive rights or remedies
19 enforceable in federal court.”). In addition, Plaintiff appears to be challenging an evidentiary
20 ruling in an ongoing New York federal court criminal proceeding. This Court cannot review the
21 decisions of other district courts. *See Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy Ct.*, 828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir.
22 1987) (federal district court also lacks authority to issue writ of mandamus to another district
23 court). Finally, Plaintiff appears to be bringing a *Bivens* action against defendants Bonanno and
24 Huggins. However, the Supreme Court has only recognized a viable *Bivens* remedy in three
25 contexts: (1) violation of the prohibition against unreasonable search and seizures under the Fourth
26 Amendment; (2) gender discrimination pursuant to the equal protection component of the due
27 process clause of the Fifth Amendment; and (3) deliberate indifference to an inmate's health care
28 needs under the Eighth Amendment. *See Carlson v. Green*, 446 U.S. 14 (1980) (Eighth


1 Amendment); *Davis v. Passman*, 442 U.S. 228 (1979) (Fifth Amendment); *Bivens v. Six Unknown*
2 *Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) (Fourth Amendment).
3 Expanding the Bivens remedy to new contexts – such as the prosecutorial misconduct alleged here
4 – is a “disfavored judicial activity,” and courts “consistently refuse[] to extend *Bivens* to any new
5 context or new category of defendants.” *Ziglar v. Abassi*, 137 S. Ct. 1843, 1857 (2017). The
6 dismissal of this action is with prejudice because amendment would be futile. *Leadsinger, Inc. v.*
7 *BMG Music Pub.*, 512 F.3d 522, 532 (9th Cir. 2008) (futility of amendment is basis for denial of
8 leave to amend).

9 **CONCLUSION**

10 For the reasons set forth above, the Court DISMISSES this action with prejudice. The
11 Clerk shall enter judgment in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff, and close the case.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Dated: 6/17/2024

14 
15 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28