1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10 11			
12	SALVADOR MENDOZA,	No. C 10-04415 JW (PR)	
13	Plaintiff, vs.	ORDER OF SERVICE; DIRECTING DEFENDANTS TO FILE DISPOSITIVE	
14	v 5.	MOTION OR NOTICE REGARDING SUCH MOTION; INSTRUCTIONS TO	
15	PAULA CRINKLAW,	CLERK	
16	Defendant.))	
17			
18	Plaintiff, an inmate at the Pelican Bay State Prison ("PBSP") in Crescent City,		
19	California, filed a <u>pro</u> se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, challenging the		
20	conditions of his confinement. Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis		
21	will be granted in a separate order. The Court will conduct its initial review of the		
22	complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.		
23			
24	DISCUSSION		
25	A. <u>Standard of Review</u>		
26	Federal courts must engage in a preli	minary screening of cases in which prisoners	
27	seek redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.		
28	28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review the court must identify any cognizable claims, and		
	Order of Service P:\PRO-SE\SJ.JW\CR.10\Mendoza04415_svc.wpd	1	
	г., сто вырож пределенновном пределение в пределение в пределение в пределение в пределение в пределение в пред		

Mendoza v. Sayers et al

Doc. 5

1 2

///

///

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. <u>Id.</u> at 1915A(b)(1),(2).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that a person acting under the color of state law committed a violation of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States. West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed. Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

B. Plaintiff's Claim

Plaintiff claims that defendant Nurse Paula Crinklaw caused damage to his left third finger which later required surgical treatment. (Compl. at 3-g.) Plaintiff claims defendant Michael C. Sayers is liable for failing to properly train defendant Crinklaw. Plaintiff claims that these defendants are liable for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs under the Eighth Amendment. Liberally construed, plaintiff's claim against defendant Crinklaw is cognizable under § 1983.

With respect to the claim against defendant Sayers, a supervisor may be liable under section 1983 upon a showing of (1) personal involvement in the constitutional deprivation or (2) a sufficient causal connection between the supervisor's wrongful conduct and the constitutional violation. Redman v. County of San Diego, 942 F.2d 1435, 1446 (9th Cir. 1991) (en banc) (citation omitted). A supervisor therefore generally "is only liable for constitutional violations of his subordinates if the supervisor participated in or directed the violations, or knew of the violations and failed to act to prevent them." Taylor v. List, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989). Plaintiff has failed to show that defendant Sayers is liable as a supervisor because he either participated in defendant Crinklaw's action or that he knew but failed to act to prevent her mistreatment. Accordingly, this claim against defendant Sayers is DISMISSED.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court orders as follows:

1. The clerk of the Court shall issue summons and the United States Marshal shall serve, without prepayment of fees, a copy of the complaint, all attachments thereto, and a copy of this order upon **defendant Nurse Paula Crinklaw** at **Pelican Bay State Prison**, (P.O. Box 7000, Crescent City, CA 95531-7000).

The claim against defendant Michael C. Sayers is DISMISSED. The Clerk shall terminate defendant Sayers from this action.

- 2. No later than **sixty** (**60**) **days** from the date of this order, defendants shall file a motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion with respect to the claims in the amended complaint found to be cognizable above.
- a. If defendants elect to file a motion to dismiss on the grounds plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), defendants shall do so in an unenumerated Rule 12(b) motion pursuant to Wyatt v. Terhune, 315 F.3d 1108, 1119-20 (9th Cir. 2003), cert. denied Alameida v. Terhune, 540 U.S. 810 (2003).
- 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 **thirty (30) days** from the date defendants' motion is filed.
 - a. In the event the defendants file an unenumerated motion to dismiss

under Rule 12(b), plaintiff is hereby cautioned as follows:¹

The defendants have made a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on the ground you have not exhausted your administrative remedies. The motion will, if granted, result in the dismissal of your case. When a party you are suing makes a motion to dismiss for failure to exhaust, and that motion is properly supported by declarations (or other sworn testimony) and/or documents, you may not simply rely on what your complaint says. Instead, you must set out specific facts in declarations, depositions, answers to interrogatories, or documents, that contradict the facts shown in the defendant's declarations and documents and show that you have in fact exhausted your claims. If you do not submit your own evidence in opposition, the motion to dismiss, if appropriate, may be granted and the case dismissed.

In the event defendants file a motion for summary judgment, b. the Ninth Circuit has held that the following notice should be given to plaintiffs:

> 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 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 in favor of defendants, your case will be dismissed and there will be no trial.

See Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 963 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc). Plaintiff is advised to read Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986) (holding party opposing summary judgment must come forward with

P:\PRO-SE\SJ.JW\CR.10\Mendoza04415_svc.wpd

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

¹ The following notice is adapted from the summary judgment notice to be given to <u>pro</u> se prisoners as set forth in Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 963 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc). See Wyatt v. Terhune, 315 F.3d at 1120 n.14.

evidence showing triable issues of material fact on every essential element of his claim). Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to file an opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment may be deemed to be a consent by plaintiff to the granting of the motion, and granting of judgment against plaintiff without a trial. See Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam); Brydges v. Lewis, 18 F.3d 651, 653 (9th Cir. 1994).

- 4. Defendants shall file a reply brief no later than **fifteen (15) days** after plaintiff's opposition is filed.
- 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.

DATED:	February 7, 2011	JAMES WARE United States District Chief Judge
		JAMES WARE
		United States District Chief Judge

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SALVADOR MENDOZA,	Case Number: CV10-04415 JW			
Plaintiff,	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE			
v.				
PAULA CRINKLAW,				
Defendant.	/			
I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I Court, Northern District of California.	am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District			
That on				
Salvador Mendoza J-84814 Pelican Bay State Prison P. O. Box 7500 Crescent City, CA 95531				
Dated:	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk			
	/s/ By: Elizabeth Garcia, Deputy Clerk			