

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VINCENTE URAIN SOLOMON,)	No. C 11-2827 LHK (PR)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER OF SERVICE;
)	ORDER DIRECTING
v.)	DEFENDANTS TO FILE
)	DISPOSITIVE MOTION OR
CDW G. LEWIS, et al.,)	NOTICE REGARDING SUCH
)	MOTION
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a second amended civil rights complaint against prison officials at Salinas Valley State Prison (“SVSP”), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. For the reasons stated below, the Court orders service upon named Defendants.

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 Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep’t.*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988).

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

5 B. Legal Claims

6 Plaintiff has filed a second amended complaint after the Court dismissed his original and
7 first amended complaints with leave to amend for a variety of deficiencies. In his second
8 amended complaint, Plaintiff alleges that he was improperly held in the Secured Housing Unit
9 (“SHU”) from April 16, 2009 through November 5, 2009, even though he was found not guilty
10 of a false rules violation report, or of any SHU-offense. Plaintiff alleges that he was denied his
11 right to due process because he was not afforded procedural protections during the hearing, such
12 as a right to call witnesses. Plaintiff also alleges that the length of time that he was improperly
13 housed in the SHU violated his right to due process. *See, e.g., Wilkinson v. Austin*, 545 U.S. 209,
14 223-25 (2005) (holding that indefinite placement in Ohio’s “supermax” facility imposes an
15 “atypical and significant hardship within the correctional context.”) Further, Plaintiff alleges
16 that he had filed staff complaints and inmate grievances, and Defendants retaliated against him
17 for filing those complaints and grievances by housing him with a known enemy, confiscating and
18 destroying his legal property, and continuing to house him in the SHU. Finally Plaintiff alleges
19 that Defendants were deliberately indifferent to his safety by knowingly housing him with a
20 known enemy. Liberally construed, Plaintiff states cognizable claims of due process violations,
21 a right to be free from retaliation, and deliberate indifference to safety.

22 To the extent Plaintiff claims that Defendants are liable for destroying his property, that
23 claim is dismissed. Ordinarily, due process of law requires notice and an opportunity for some
24 kind of hearing prior to the deprivation of a significant property interest. *See Memphis Light,*
25 *Gas & Water Div. v. Craft*, 436 U.S. 1, 19 (1978). However, the intentional deprivation of
26 property does not state a due process claim under § 1983 if the deprivation was random and
27 unauthorized. *See Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517, 533 (1984) (intentional destruction of
28 inmate's property). The availability of an adequate state post-deprivation remedy, e.g., a state

1 tort action, precludes relief because it provides sufficient procedural due process. *See Zinermon*
2 *v. Burch*, 494 U.S. 113, 128 (1990).

3 In his second amended complaint, Plaintiff fails to link Defendants R. Davis, D. Foston,
4 M. Hodges, N. Grannis, S.T. Smith, to a viable claim by failing to provide facts showing the
5 basis for liability for each of these Defendants. As such, and because Plaintiff has already been
6 given the opportunity to cure this deficiency, Defendants R. Davis, D. Foston, M. Hodges, N.
7 Grannis, S.T. Smith are DISMISSED from this action.

8 CONCLUSION

9 For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby orders as follows:

10 1. Defendants R. Davis, D. Foston, M. Hodges, N. Grannis, S.T. Smith are
11 DISMISSED.

12 2. The Clerk of the Court shall mail a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of
13 Service of Summons, two copies of the Waiver of Service of Summons, a copy of the second
14 amended complaint and all attachments thereto (docket no. 14), and a copy of this Order to
15 Defendants **CDW G. Lewis, C/O Dornan, Sgt. Moyers, Lt. A Oyarzabal, Lt. Atchely, Lt. J.**
16 **Ippolito, CC2 V. Solis, CDW J. Negrete, Capt. M. Bryant, CC2 T. Miner, Sgt. P. Murphy,**
17 **CSR J. Short, C/O Hollingworth, C/O Blakemanship, C/O Syner, C/O Citch, C/O K.**
18 **Cannon, C/O B. Long, C/O J. Cable, and Sgt. Bonville at Salinas Valley State Prison.**

19 The Clerk of the Court shall also mail a courtesy copy of the second amended complaint
20 and a copy of this Order to the California Attorney General's Office. Additionally, the Clerk
21 shall mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.

22 3. Defendants are cautioned that Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
23 requires them to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint.
24 Pursuant to Rule 4, if Defendants, after being notified of this action and asked by the Court, on
25 behalf of Plaintiff, to waive service of the summons, fail to do so, they will be required to bear
26 the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for their failure to sign and return the waiver
27 form. If service is waived, this action will proceed as if Defendants had been served on the date
28 that the waiver is filed, except that pursuant to Rule 12(a)(1)(B), Defendants will not be required

1 to serve and file an answer before **sixty (60) days** from the date on which the request for waiver
2 was sent. (This allows a longer time to respond than would be required if formal service of
3 summons is necessary.) Defendants are asked to read the statement set forth at the bottom of the
4 waiver form that more completely describes the duties of the parties with regard to waiver of
5 service of the summons. If service is waived after the date provided in the Notice but before
6 Defendants have been personally served, the Answer shall be due **sixty (60) days** from the date
7 on which the request for waiver was sent or **twenty (20) days** from the date the waiver form is
8 filed, whichever is later.

9 4. No later than **ninety (90) days** from the date of this order, Defendants shall file a
10 motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion with respect to the cognizable claims
11 in the second amended complaint.

12 a. If Defendants elect to file a motion to dismiss on the grounds that Plaintiff
13 failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a),
14 Defendants shall do so in an unenumerated Rule 12(b) motion pursuant to *Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315
15 F.3d 1108, 1119-20 (9th Cir. 2003).

16 b. Any motion for summary judgment shall be supported by adequate factual
17 documentation and shall conform in all respects to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil
18 Procedure. **Defendants are advised that summary judgment cannot be granted, nor**
19 **qualified immunity found, if material facts are in dispute. If Defendants are of the opinion**
20 **that this case cannot be resolved by summary judgment, they shall so inform the Court**
21 **prior to the date the summary judgment motion is due.**

22 5. Plaintiff's opposition to the dispositive motion shall be filed with the Court and
23 served on Defendants no later than **thirty (30) days** from the date Defendants' motion is filed.

24 a. In the event Defendants file an unenumerated motion to dismiss under
25 Rule 12(b), Plaintiff is hereby cautioned as follows:¹

27 ¹ The following notice is adapted from the summary judgment notice to be given to pro se
28 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.

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

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

14 The defendants have made a motion for summary judgment by which they
15 seek to have your case dismissed. A motion for summary judgment under Rule
16 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will, if granted, end your case.

17 Rule 56 tells you what you must do in order to oppose a motion for
18 summary judgment. Generally, summary judgment must be granted when there is
19 no genuine issue of material fact – that is, if there is no real dispute about any fact
20 that would affect the result of your case, the party who asked for summary
21 judgment is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, which will end your case.
22 When a party you are suing makes a motion for summary judgment that is
23 properly supported by declarations (or other sworn testimony), you cannot simply
24 rely on what your complaint says. Instead, you must set out specific facts in
25 declarations, depositions, answers to interrogatories, or authenticated documents,
26 as provided in Rule 56(e), that contradict the facts shown in the defendants'
27 declarations and documents and show that there is a genuine issue of material fact
28 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.

19 *See Rand v. Rowland*, 154 F.3d 952, 963 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc). Plaintiff is advised to read
20 Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317
21 (1986) (holding party opposing summary judgment must come forward with evidence showing
22 triable issues of material fact on every essential element of his claim).

23 6. Defendants shall file a reply brief no later than **fifteen (15) days** after Plaintiff's
24 opposition is filed.

25 7. The motion shall be deemed submitted as of the date the reply brief is due. No
26 hearing will be held on the motion unless the Court so orders at a later date.

27 8. All communications by the Plaintiff with the Court must be served on Defendants
28 or Defendants' counsel, by mailing a true copy of the document to Defendants or Defendants'

1 counsel.

2 9. Discovery may be taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
3 No further Court order is required before the parties may conduct discovery.

4 10. It is Plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the Court
5 and all parties informed of any change of address and must comply with the Court's orders in a
6 timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute
7 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: 4/9/12



LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28