1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	MILAUDI KARBOAU, ) No. C 12-00705 EJD (PR)		
11	Plaintiff, ) ORDER OF DISMISSAL		
12	v. )		
13			
14	EMMANUEL EKE ENYINWA,		
15	Defendant.		
16	/		
17	Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a civil law suit against his former attorney		
18	Defendant Emmanuel Eke Enyinwa. For the reasons discussed below, this case is		
19	DISMISSED without prejudice.		
20			
21	DISCUSSION		
22	A federal court must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a		
23	prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a		
24	governmental entity. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the court must identify		
25	any cognizable claims and dismiss any claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a		
26	claim upon which relief may be granted or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is		
27	immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), (2). Pro se pleadings must,		
28	however, be liberally construed. See <u>Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't</u> , 901 F.2d 696,		
	Order of Dismissal G:\PRO-SE\SJ.EJD\CR.12\00705Karboau_dism.wpd		

Doc. 8

Dockets.Justia.com

Karboau v. Enyinwa

699 (9th Cir. 1988).

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

Plaintiff claims his former attorney Defendant Enyinwa violated his ethical and professional responsibilities in representing Plaintiff during deportation proceedings in San Francisco, California. Plaintiff claims that Defendant violated his right to effective assistance of counsel under Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984). Plaintiff claims that this Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3).

Plaintiff's civil action against his former attorney must be dismissed. Attorneys in private practice are not state actors. See Simmons v. Sacramento County Superior Court, 318 F.3d 1156, 1161 (9th Cir. 2003); see also Kimes v. Stone, 84 F.3d 1121, 1126 (9th Cir. 1996) (attorneys are private actors). Services performed by a private attorney in connection with a lawsuit do not constitute action under color of state law. See Franklin v. Oregon, 662 F.2d 1337, 1345 (9th Cir. 1981); Briley v. California, 564 F.2d 849, 855-56 (9th Cir. 1977). And claims for legal malpractice do not come within the jurisdiction of the federal courts. See Franklin, 662 F.2d at 1344. Accordingly, this action must be dismissed to Plaintiff filing it in a state action.

**CONCLUSION** 

For the foregoing reasons, this action is hereby DISMISSED for lack of federal jurisdiction. The Clerk shall terminate all pending motions as moot.

25 DATED: <u>6/26/2012</u>

EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE

## NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MILAUDI KARBOAU,		Case Number: CV12-00705 EJD
	Plaintiff,	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
v.		
EMMANUEL	L EKE ENYINWA,	
	Defendant.	
	gned, hereby certify that I rn District of California.	am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District
hereinafter lis	lacing said copy(ies) in a	, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) nvelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into ted in the Clerk's office.
Milaudi Karbo 1818 NE Mar Portland, OR	in Luther King Blvd	
Dated:	6/27/2012	
		Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Elizabeth Garcia, Deputy Clerk