

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ADIL HIRAMANNEK, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
L. MICHAEL CLARK, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 5:13-cv-00228-RMW

**ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR CLAIMS  
INVOLVING MCCHRISTIAN, PLETT,  
AND POLUMBUS**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 430, 438

Pro se plaintiffs Roda and Adil Hirananeck, mother and son, filed suit against various defendants associated with the Santa Clara County Superior Court, alleging violations of their civil rights. Dkt. No. 94-1 (Revised Second Amended Complaint, or “RSAC”). Before the court are a motion for partial summary judgment filed by defendants Daryl McChristian, Bryan Plett, and Timothy Polumbus (herein “defendants”), Dkt. No. 430, and a motion for partial summary judgment against these defendants filed by plaintiff Adil Hirananeck, Dkt. No. 438.<sup>1</sup> The court held a hearing on these motions on February 5, 2016. Having considered the parties’ submissions, the record in this case, and the relevant law, the court hereby GRANTS defendants’ motion and DENIES plaintiff’s motion.

---

<sup>1</sup> This order does not address plaintiffs’ claims against defendants Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara or Beth Miller. *See* Dkt. Nos. 546, 570 (orders granting summary judgment in favor of defendant Superior Court); Dkt. No. 708 (jury verdict in favor of Miller).

1 **I. BACKGROUND**

2 Plaintiffs commenced this lawsuit on January 17, 2013 asserting claims arising out of their  
3 interactions with individuals associated with defendant Superior Court. Defendants McChristian,  
4 Plett, and Polumbus are employees of the Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Office and have worked at  
5 the Superior Court’s Family Courthouse. *See* RSAC ¶ 8. After several amendments to plaintiffs’  
6 complaint that followed reviews under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) and motions to dismiss by certain  
7 defendants, this court allowed Mr. Hiranek to proceed on the following claims from the  
8 operative complaint against McChristian, Plett, and Polumbus:

9 **Claim 10:** 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim against Polumbus and Plett in  
10 their individual capacities, based on alleged violation of plaintiff’s  
11 Fourth Amendment rights, including “unreasonable and invasive  
12 bodily search, search of his property, seizure of his property,  
13 including mobile phone, deleting information/writing” and  
14 “unreasonabl[e] [detention] for unreasonably long periods of time.”

15 **Claim 17:** Section 1983 claim against McChristian and Plett in their  
16 individual capacities, based on alleged violations of plaintiff’s  
17 Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights, when McChristian and Plett  
18 allegedly detained, interrogated, and confined plaintiff at the Santa  
19 Clara County Superior Courthouse.

20 **Claim 44:** Section 1983 claim against McChristian and Plett in their  
21 individual capacities, based on alleged violations of plaintiff’s  
22 Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights, when McChristian and Plett  
23 allegedly used excessive force against plaintiff when arresting him.

24 Dkt. No. 201 at 2-3. Claims 10, 17, and 44 are asserted by plaintiff Adil Hiranek and not by  
25 plaintiff Roda Hiranek.

26 **A. Claim 10**

27 Polumbus operates the x-ray screening machine at the Family Courthouse security station.  
28 Dkt. No. 431 (“Polumbus Decl.”) ¶ 2. Under Claim 10 of the RSAC, plaintiff alleges that  
29 Polumbus illegally searched plaintiff’s bags when plaintiff entered the courthouse. Plaintiff also  
30 alleges that on January 14, 2013, Polumbus allowed other individuals to pass through security but  
31 made plaintiff wait for an excessive amount of time before Polumbus manually searched  
32 plaintiff’s bag. RSAC ¶¶ 109-110.

33 Plett is a Deputy Sheriff. He was a member of the security detail at the Family Courthouse  
34 security station, and he served as courtroom deputy to Superior Court Judge Michael Clark. Dkt.

1 No. 433 (“Plett Decl.”) ¶¶ 2–4. Under Claim 10 of the RSAC, plaintiff alleges that Plett illegally  
2 confiscated and searched plaintiff’s cell phone in Judge Clark’s courtroom on April 16, 2012.  
3 RSAC ¶ 116. Plaintiff also alleges that Plett illegally detained him, confiscated his cell phone, and  
4 made plaintiff delete materials from his cell phone on January 15, 2013. *Id.* ¶¶ 117-118. Finally,  
5 plaintiff alleges that on June 8, 2012, Plett ordered plaintiff to step away from a conversation Plett  
6 was having with a court employee and “sit in the corner” of the courthouse lobby. *Id.* ¶ 119.

7 **B. Claim 17**

8 McChristian is a Deputy Sheriff and coordinated all Family Courthouse security. Dkt. No.  
9 432 (“McChristian Decl.”) ¶ 2. Under Claim 17 of the RSAC, plaintiff alleges that on June 11,  
10 2012, McChristian illegally detained and questioned plaintiff in connection with a criminal  
11 investigation into allegations that plaintiff filed court documents with forged signatures and/or  
12 violated an order that declared plaintiff a vexatious litigant. *See* RSAC ¶¶ 181-192; Dkt. No. 432  
13 ¶ 3. This claim also includes allegations that McChristian questioned plaintiff in violation of his  
14 *Miranda* rights. *Id.* ¶ 197.

15 Under Claim 17 of the RSAC, plaintiff also alleges that on June 29, 2012, McChristian and  
16 Plett questioned him in violation of his *Miranda* rights and denied plaintiff water and pain  
17 medication after his arrest on forgery charges. *See* RSAC ¶¶ 199-203.

18 **C. Claim 44**

19 Under Claim 44 of the RSAC, plaintiff sues McChristian and Plett for excessive force and  
20 cruel and unusual punishment during his arrest on June 29, 2012. Specifically, he alleges that  
21 McChristian and Plett denied him water and pain medication (as in Claim Number 17), and that  
22 Plett—but not McChristian—used excessive force by twisting his arm while plaintiff was in  
23 handcuffs. *See* RSAC ¶¶ 1067-72.

24 **D. Procedural History**

25 McChristian, Plett, and Polumbus filed their motion for summary judgment on December  
26 30, 2015. Dkt. No. 430. Plaintiff filed an opposition on January 14, 2016, Dkt. No. 449, and  
27 defendants filed a reply on January 21, 2016, Dkt. No. 454.

28

1 Plaintiff filed his motion for summary judgment against McChristian, Plett, and Polumbus  
2 on December 31, 2015. Dkt. No. 438. Defendants filed an opposition on January 14, 2016, Dkt.  
3 No. 446, and Plaintiff filed a reply on January 21, 2016, Dkt. No. 459.

4 The court held a hearing on these motions on February 5, 2016.

5 **II. ANALYSIS**

6 **A. Legal Standard**

7 Summary judgment is proper where the pleadings, discovery and affidavits demonstrate  
8 that there is “no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a  
9 matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). Material facts are those that may affect the outcome of the  
10 case. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). A dispute as to a material fact is  
11 genuine if there is sufficient evidence for a reasonable jury to return a verdict for the nonmoving  
12 party. *Id.*

13 The party moving for summary judgment bears the initial burden of identifying those  
14 portions of the pleadings, discovery, and affidavits which demonstrate the absence of a genuine  
15 issue of material fact. *Celotex Corp. v. Cattrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986). Where the moving  
16 party will have the burden of proof on an issue at trial, it must affirmatively demonstrate that no  
17 reasonable trier of fact could find other than for the moving party. But on an issue for which the  
18 opposing party will have the burden of proof at trial, the moving party need only point out “that  
19 there is an absence of evidence to support the nonmoving party’s case.” *Id.* at 325.

20 Once the moving party meets its initial burden, the nonmoving party must go beyond the  
21 pleadings and, by its own affidavits or discovery, set forth specific facts showing that there is a  
22 genuine issue for trial. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1)(A). The court is only concerned with disputes  
23 over material facts, and “[f]actual disputes that are irrelevant or unnecessary will not be counted.”  
24 *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 248. It is not the task of the court to scour the record in search of a genuine  
25 issue of triable fact. *Keenan v. Allen*, 91 F.3d 1275, 1279 (9th Cir. 1996). The nonmoving party  
26 has the burden of identifying, with reasonable particularity, the evidence that precludes summary  
27 judgment. *Id.* If the nonmoving party fails to make this showing, “the moving party is entitled to  
28

1 judgment as a matter of law.” *Celotex Corp.*, 477 U.S. at 323.

2 The court’s function on a summary judgment motion is not to make credibility  
3 determinations or weigh conflicting evidence with respect to a disputed material fact. *See T.W.*  
4 *Elec. Serv. v. Pacific Elec. Contractors Ass’n*, 809 F.2d 626, 630 (9th Cir. 1987). The evidence  
5 must be viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, and the inferences to be drawn  
6 from the facts must be viewed in a light most favorable to the nonmoving party. *See id.* at 631.

7 **B. Evidentiary Issues**

8 Defendants object to the admissibility of deposition transcripts, Dkt. No. 439 Ex. B, I, and  
9 J, that Mr. Hiranek, rather than the certified court reporter, created. *E.g.*, Dkt. No. 454 at 1. The  
10 court finds that Mr. Hiranek’s transcripts contain argumentative characterizations of witness  
11 actions that bring the transcripts’ reliability into question. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 439 at ECF p. 150:8-  
12 9 (“[video shows wrist bent at almost 90 degree]”), ECF p. 246:2-4 (“[video tape of the deposition  
13 corroborates the two documents being displayed on camera]”). In general, defendants’ objections  
14 are sustained, and the court will not rely on Mr. Hiranek’s unofficial transcripts unless  
15 otherwise specified.

16 Plaintiff objects to defendants’ submission of a photograph of a sign at the Family  
17 Courthouse warning visitors that photography is prohibited, Dkt. No. 431-1, because defendants  
18 allegedly did not produce the photograph during discovery. Dkt. No. 449 at 5. Defendants claim  
19 they produced the photograph at a deposition. Dkt. No. 454 at 4. The court need not rule on the  
20 admissibility of the photograph itself because plaintiff fails to rebut Polumbus’s declaration  
21 regarding signage at the entrance to the Family Courthouse. *See* Dkt. No. 431 ¶ 3.

22 The court need not rule on any other objections to evidence that this order does not cite or  
23 rely upon.

24 **C. Deputies’ Motion for Summary Judgment Against Plaintiff**

25 **1. Claim 10 – Polumbus’s Security Screenings**

26 Hiranek’s claims against Polumbus relate to Polumbus’s searches of plaintiff’s bags for  
27 prohibited items at the Santa Clara County Family Courthouse. Polumbus seeks judgment on  
28

1 Claim 10 on the grounds that: (1) he did not violate plaintiff’s constitutional right to be free from  
2 illegal detention, search and seizure; or, alternatively (2) that he is entitled to qualified immunity.

3 **a. Rules on Photography and Recording Devices**

4 Because plaintiff’s allegations under Claim 10 largely relate to incidents involving his  
5 electronic devices, it is necessary to discuss California court rules regarding photography and  
6 recording devices. California Rule of Court 1.150 prohibits recording courthouse proceedings  
7 without prior court approval. The rule states, in relevant part: “Except as provided in this rule,  
8 court proceedings may not be photographed, recorded, or broadcast.” Cal. R. of Court 1.150(c).  
9 “The judge may permit inconspicuous personal recording devices to be used by persons in a  
10 courtroom to make sound recordings as personal notes of the proceedings. A person proposing to  
11 use a recording device must obtain advance permission from the judge.” Cal. R. of Court 1.150(d).  
12 “Any violation of [Rule 1.150] or an order made under this rule is an unlawful interference with  
13 the proceedings of the court and may be the basis for . . . a citation for contempt of court, or an  
14 order imposing monetary or other sanctions as provided by law.” Cal. R. of Court 1.150(f).

15 The Santa Clara County Superior Court has extended the prohibition on photography and  
16 recording beyond courtrooms:

17 Any and all “photographing” and/or “recording” and/or  
18 “broadcasting” as defined by California Rules of Court, Rule  
19 1.150(b) of people, things, conversations, or proceedings is strictly  
20 prohibited in any courthouse facility, including but not limited to  
21 stairways, elevators, waiting areas, hallways, entrances, **security**  
22 **screening stations**, service areas, through windows, through doors,  
and with respect to any other accessible areas of courthouse  
facilities, whether access was intended or not, absent written order  
of the Supervising Judge of the specific courthouse facility. **Any**  
**device that appears capable of photographing, recording, or**  
**broadcasting is subject to confiscation.**

23 Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, General Rule 2B(1) (emphasis added).

24 General Rule 2C provides penalties for violating these rules:

25 Any violation of this Local Rule or an order made under this Local  
26 Rule, or of California Rule of Court, Rule 1.150, is an unlawful  
27 interference with court proceedings and may be the basis for an  
order terminating media coverage, a citation for contempt of court,  
or an order imposing monetary or other sanctions as provided by  
28 law.

1 *Id.* Rule 2C. According to Polumbus, the Superior Court Family Courthouse has signage posted at  
2 its entrance near the security screening station advising that all persons and their property are  
3 subject to screening inspections and that no photographs, video, or audio recordings are permitted  
4 anywhere in the facility except with a proper order from the court. Dkt. No. 431 ¶ 3.

5 **b. Polumbus’s Security Screenings of Plaintiff**

6 Plaintiff has made numerous appearances at the Family Courthouse. *See, e.g.*, RSAC ¶  
7 108. Polumbus explains that every time plaintiff passed through the Family Courthouse security  
8 station in Polumbus’s presence, plaintiff placed a bag on the x-ray screening machine’s conveyor  
9 belt. Dkt. No. 431 ¶ 6. Every time plaintiff placed his bag through the x-ray machine while  
10 Polumbus was operating it, the machine showed that the bag contained at least one camera and/or  
11 recording device. *Id.* In each such instance, Polumbus retained the device(s) in question, provided  
12 plaintiff with a claim card, and then returned the device(s) to plaintiff when he exited the building.  
13 *Id.*

14 It is undisputed that on one occasion, Polumbus retained plaintiff’s bag for some amount of  
15 time<sup>2</sup> and allowed other individuals to pass through the security line before Polumbus manually  
16 searched plaintiff’s bag. *See id.* ¶ 7, RSAC ¶ 109. Polumbus indicates that he retained plaintiff’s  
17 bag because it appeared from the x-ray image that plaintiff’s bag was excessively full, and  
18 searching it would unduly delay others from entering the courthouse. Dkt. No. 431 ¶ 7.

19 **c. Warrantless Administrative Searches**

20 Polumbus argues that he is entitled to summary judgment because performing a  
21 warrantless administrative search of plaintiff’s bag did not violate plaintiff’s constitutional rights.  
22 Under the Fourth Amendment, a warrantless search of private property without consent is  
23 unreasonable, except in specific classes of cases. Among the “carefully defined classes of cases”  
24 for which no warrant is needed are administrative searches. *Klarfeld v. United States*, 944 F.2d  
25 583, 586 (9th Cir. 1991). Warrantless administrative searches are authorized for persons entering  
26

---

27 <sup>2</sup> The parties appear to dispute the exact amount of time, but plaintiff does not argue how, if at all,  
28 the amount of time the bag was held should affect the court’s analysis of whether a search was  
unreasonable.

1 sensitive public facilities, including courthouses. *Id.* (finding that requirement that plaintiff  
2 remove shoes at courthouse security checkpoint was not facially unreasonable but remanding for  
3 determination of whether less intrusive searches were available); *McMorris v. Alioto*, 567 F.2d  
4 897, 899 (9th Cir. 1978) (upholding searches of briefcases for weapons and pat-down screenings  
5 of individuals who set off magnetometers at courthouse). Nonetheless, “[t]o pass constitutional  
6 muster, an administrative search must meet the Fourth Amendment’s standard of reasonableness.”  
7 *Klarfeld*, 944 F.2d at 586 (citation omitted). As the Ninth Circuit explained, “[t]he search must be  
8 limited and no more intrusive than necessary to protect against the danger to be avoided, but  
9 nevertheless reasonably effective to discover the materials sought. The inspection must be  
10 conducted for a purpose other than the gathering of evidence for criminal prosecutions.”  
11 *McMorris*, 567 F.2d at 899. Express consent to an administrative search is not required; implied  
12 consent is sufficient. *Id.* at 900-01 (finding that people who enter courthouse provide implied  
13 consent to passing through magnetometer).

14 Citing *McMorris* and *Klarfeld*, Polumbus argues that he is entitled to summary judgment  
15 because using an x-ray scanner and a secondary manual screening procedure to search for  
16 prohibited items such as weapons and recording devices was reasonable. Dkt. No. 430 at 9.  
17 Plaintiff does not challenge the general legal standard articulated above. *See* Dkt. No. 449 at 11  
18 (citing *Klarfeld*). Instead, plaintiff raises several arguments. First, plaintiff asserts that he never  
19 brought weapons to the courthouse and that no security emergency justified a search of his bag.  
20 Dkt. No. 449 at 4. Plaintiff’s argument is unpersuasive. Courts have long held that screenings for  
21 weapons are acceptable at courthouses, even in the absence of a specific, imminent threat. *See*  
22 *McMorris*, 567 F.2d at 899. The court acknowledges that smartphones, cameras, and other  
23 recording devices do not pose the same imminent threat as guns or knives, for example. Such  
24 devices could, however, disrupt court proceedings, allow witnesses or jurors to be photographed  
25 and intimidated, or allow criminals to record and then circumvent security protocols. California  
26 Rule of Court 1.150(e)(3)(E) explicitly recognizes “privacy rights of all participants in the  
27 proceeding, including witnesses, jurors, and victims.” Plaintiff, moreover, cites no authority  
28



1 indicating that it is impermissible to search for devices that could interfere with these privacy and  
2 safety interests.

3 Plaintiff next attacks the rules under which his bag was searched. *See* Dkt. No. 449 at 2. He  
4 argues that California Rule of Court 1.150(c) only prohibits photographing or recording “court  
5 proceedings,” not areas of a courthouse that are outside of courtrooms. The court need not  
6 determine whether plaintiff’s interpretation of Rule 1.150 is correct because, as noted above, Santa  
7 Clara County Superior Court General Rule 2B prohibits photographing and recording “in any  
8 courthouse facility.” Moreover, the local rule explicitly provides that “[a]ny device that appears  
9 capable of photographing, recording, or broadcasting is subject to confiscation.” *Id.* Plaintiff  
10 argues that Superior Court General Rule 2E is preempted by state Rule 1.150 and that Rule 1.150  
11 is preempted by the U.S. Constitution. However, plaintiff provides no authority or analysis to  
12 suggest inconsistency between these rules, let alone preemption.

13 Plaintiff asserts that when he approached the checkpoint with a recording device, he  
14 removed the device from his bag before any search occurred and handed it to security screeners,  
15 thus eliminating their need to search the bag. Dkt. No. 449 at 3. However, plaintiff’s brief cites no  
16 evidence that he handed his devices to Polumbus. Moreover, even if plaintiff had handed an  
17 individual device to Polumbus, plaintiff does not dispute the portion of Polumbus’s sworn  
18 declaration that states: “On every one of the occasions that Hiranamek placed his bag through the  
19 x-ray machine while I was operating it, the machine showed that the bag contained at least one  
20 camera and/or recording device. Usually it was multiple devices, and sometimes as many as six  
21 devices.” Dkt. No. 431 ¶ 6. All of the admissible evidence presented suggests that Polumbus was  
22 searching for banned electronic devices that would be returned to plaintiff when plaintiff left the  
23 courthouse; plaintiff has presented no evidence that Polumbus was gathering evidence for criminal  
24 prosecution. Thus, the court finds that searching plaintiff’s bag was reasonable.

25 Polumbus also argues that by passing through the security checkpoint with a bag, when  
26 plaintiff could have left the bag in another location, plaintiff gave implied consent to an x-ray  
27 search or manual search of his belongings. Dkt. No. 430 at 10. Plaintiff argues that he was not free  
28

1 to return his bag to his car, as his court appearance was required in a suit initiated by his ex-wife,  
2 and he needed his papers for hearings. Dkt. No. 449 at 4-5. The Ninth Circuit rejected plaintiff's  
3 argument in *McMorris* when it ruled: "Although an attorney's consent to a search is exacted as the  
4 price of entering the courthouse to discharge duties necessary to his profession, the search is  
5 nevertheless consensual in the same way as in the airport search cases." 567 F.2d at 901.  
6 Moreover, as Polumbus points out, plaintiff does not dispute that he could have left any recording  
7 devices behind and still entered the courthouse with his bag and his papers.

8 Based on the factual record presented to the court, the court agrees with Polumbus that the  
9 searches of plaintiff's bag did not violate plaintiff's constitutional rights.

10 **d. Qualified Immunity**

11 Polumbus also contends that he is entitled to qualified immunity. "The doctrine of  
12 qualified immunity protects government officials 'from liability for civil damages insofar as their  
13 conduct does not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable  
14 person would have known.'" *Pearson v. Callahan*, 555 U.S. 223, 231 (2009) (citing *Harlow v.*  
15 *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982)). "The protection of qualified immunity applies regardless of  
16 whether the government official's error is a mistake of law, a mistake of fact, or a mistake based  
17 on mixed questions of law and fact." *Id.* (quotation marks and citation omitted). In assessing a  
18 claim of qualified immunity, a court must examine: (1) whether the facts that a plaintiff has  
19 alleged (in the case of a motion to dismiss) or shown (in the case of summary judgment) make out  
20 a violation of a constitutional right; and (2) whether that right was "clearly established" at the time  
21 of the defendant's alleged misconduct. *See id.* at 232. Courts are "permitted to exercise their sound  
22 discretion in deciding which of the two prongs of the qualified immunity analysis should be  
23 addressed first." *Id.* at 236.

24 In this case, Polumbus argues that both state and local rules prohibit the use of recording  
25 devices in courtrooms and that when plaintiff placed his bag on the x-ray scanning device, plaintiff  
26 consented to a search of the bag. Polumbus notes that he performed manual searches of bags only  
27 when the x-ray revealed items that may have been prohibited, such as recording devices. *See* Dkt.  
28

1 No. 431 ¶ 7. Polumbus argues that a reasonable security screener in his position would have  
2 believed that his actions were lawful.

3 In response, plaintiff argues that in a deposition, Polumbus offered no factual predicate for  
4 his qualified immunity defense. *See* Dkt. No. 449 at 9. Plaintiff’s argument incorrectly assumes  
5 that Polumbus had the burden of submitting testimony in support of his immunity arguments. In  
6 evaluating qualified immunity, “a court must decide whether the facts that a *plaintiff* has alleged  
7 or shown make out a violation of a constitutional right,” and, if so, “whether the right at issue was  
8 ‘clearly established.’” *Pearson*, 555 U.S. at 232 (emphasis added and citations omitted).

9 Plaintiff generally refers to various constitutional rights that he claims were violated,  
10 including the right for redress of grievances, the right to freedom from unreasonable search and  
11 seizure, the right to due process, and the right to freedom from cruel and unusual punishment,  
12 among others. *See* Dkt. No. 449 at 9. Plaintiff also cites authority suggesting that searches should  
13 be limited and no more intrusive than necessary to protect against the danger to be avoided. *See id.*  
14 at 12. Plaintiff does not, however, argue or cite any authority suggesting that it is unconstitutional  
15 to search bags that enter courthouses for prohibited items. On the other hand, Polumbus cites two  
16 Ninth Circuit opinions indicating that warrantless administrative searches for contraband at  
17 courthouses may be reasonable. *See Klarfeld*, 944 F.2d at 586; *McMorris*, 567 F.2d at 897. Even if  
18 Polumbus had been mistaken in believing that searching plaintiff’s bag does not violate the  
19 constitution—and the court is not convinced that he was mistaken—the mistake was not so clear  
20 as to expose defendant to liability. The court concludes that qualified immunity protects  
21 Polumbus.

22 For the reasons stated above, Polumbus’s motion for summary judgment is GRANTED.

23 **2. Claim 10 – Plett**

24 Plaintiff’s claims against Plett under Claim 10 relate to three incidents. First, on or about  
25 April 16, 2012, Plett confiscated plaintiff’s cell phone after he saw plaintiff using the phone during  
26 proceedings in Judge Clark’s courtroom. Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 3; *see* RSAC ¶ 116. Plett returned the  
27 phone when plaintiff left the courtroom. Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 3. Second, on or about January 15, 2013,  
28

1 Plett questioned plaintiff about plaintiff taking photos of a courthouse security checkpoint, and  
2 Plett had plaintiff delete two photos of the checkpoint from plaintiff's phone. Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 4.  
3 Third, on or about June 8, 2012, Plett allegedly ordered plaintiff to step away from a conversation  
4 Plett was having with another courthouse employee.<sup>3</sup> See RSAC ¶ 119. Plett seeks judgment on  
5 Claim 10 on the grounds: (1) that he did not violate plaintiff's constitutional right to be free from  
6 illegal detention, search and seizure; or, alternatively: (2) that he is entitled to qualified immunity.

7 **a. April 16, 2012 Incidents**

8 Plett argues that both the April 2012 and the January 2013 "seizures" of plaintiff's cell  
9 phone were lawful under the plain-view exception to the Fourth Amendment. Dkt. No. 430 at 13,  
10 14. Law enforcement officers may seize evidence without a warrant pursuant to the plain-view  
11 exception if (1) the initial intrusion is lawful, and (2) the incriminatory nature of the evidence is  
12 immediately apparent to the officer. *United States v. Garcia*, 205 F.3d 1182, 1187 (9th Cir. 2000).  
13 The U.S. Supreme Court has held that "if police are lawfully in a position from which they view  
14 an object, if its incriminating character is immediately apparent, and if the officers have a lawful  
15 right of access to the object, they may seize it without a warrant." *Minnesota v. Dickerson*, 508  
16 U.S. 366, 375 (1993).

17 In this case, as noted above, California Rule of Court 1.150(f) and Santa Clara County  
18 Superior Court General Rule 2C make unauthorized use of certain electronic devices in courthouse  
19 locations punishable by a citation for contempt. Moreover, as Plett points out, a person guilty of  
20 contempt of court may be guilty of a corresponding misdemeanor under California Penal Code  
21 Section 166. Plaintiff does not dispute Plett's assertion that on or about April 16, 2012, Plett  
22 observed plaintiff using a cellphone during proceedings in court, and Plett then seized the device.  
23 Because plaintiff's cell phone was the instrument of a crime and was in plain view, the Fourth  
24

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>3</sup> To the extent that plaintiff asserts that Claim 10 covers alleged incidents beyond those discussed  
27 in this order, plaintiff is improperly attempting to extend Claim 10 beyond the scope previously  
28 allowed by this court's orders. *Compare* Dkt. No. 449 at 8 (citing RSAC ¶ 115 for the allegation  
that Plett "breathed down Plaintiff's neck") with Dkt. No. 201 at 2 (noting that RSAC ¶¶ 108-110,  
116-19 remained at issue under Claim 10). Plaintiff's general allegations of intimidation fail to  
state a claim on which relief can be granted.

1 Amendment allowed Plett to seize the device.

2 Plaintiff argues that it was not the seizure, but instead Plett’s “intensively searching  
3 ADIL’s mobile phone, fishing for information,” that forms the basis for plaintiff’s claim. Dkt. No.  
4 449 at 8. Here however, plaintiff does not point to any admissible evidence that a cell phone  
5 search even happened in April 2012. Plaintiff merely cites to allegations in his complaint.  
6 However, allegations in a pleading are not evidence that can be used to defeat summary judgment.  
7 *See Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 324 (holding that Rule 56 “requires the nonmoving party to go beyond  
8 the pleadings and by her own affidavits, or by the ‘depositions, answers to interrogatories, and  
9 admissions on file,’ designate ‘specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial’”).

10 Even if Plett did search the phone that he seized from plaintiff in the courtroom, and even  
11 if that search were unlawful absent a warrant—and plaintiff has cited no cases that support such a  
12 finding—Plett is entitled to qualified immunity. This is true because the unlawfulness of searching  
13 a cellphone that was the instrument of a crime was not clearly established at the time of the alleged  
14 search in April 2012. *See Rouzan v. Dorta*, No. EDCV 12-1361-BRO JPR, 2014 WL 1716094  
15 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2014) (recommending summary judgment that qualified immunity protected  
16 sheriff’s deputy who allegedly searched phone with camera used in courthouse because “the law  
17 regarding the search of a cellphone incident to arrest was not clearly established”), *report and*  
18 *recommendation adopted*, 2014 WL 1725783 (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2014).

19 While it is true that the U.S. Supreme Court eventually ruled that “officers must generally  
20 secure a warrant before conducting” a search of a cellphone incident to a lawful arrest, that  
21 decision was not issued until June 25, 2014. *Riley v. California*, 134 S. Ct. 2473, 2485 (2014).  
22 Indeed, *Riley* was an appeal of a 2013 California Court of Appeal decision that had held that a  
23 search of a cellphone incident to a lawful arrest did *not* require a warrant. *See Rouzan*, 2014 WL  
24 1716094 at \*10 n.9 (citing *People v. Riley*, No. D059840, 2013 WL 475242, at \*6 (Cal. Ct. App.  
25 Feb.8, 2013)). Qualified immunity is determined “at the time of defendant’s alleged misconduct.”  
26 *Pearson*, 555 U.S. at 232. Regardless of whether detainees now have a clearly established right to  
27 be free from warrantless cellphone searches—an issue that is not before this court—such a right  
28

1 was not clearly established in 2012.<sup>4</sup>

2 Accordingly, Plett is entitled to qualified immunity.

3 **b. January 15, 2013 Incidents**

4 Plaintiff alleges that Plett violated the Fourth Amendment on January 15, 2013 by  
5 detaining plaintiff, seizing his phone, and deleting photos from the phone. Plett argues that it was  
6 lawful for Plett to detain plaintiff because Plett believed that plaintiff was committing a crime.  
7 Police may “seize” a citizen for a brief investigatory stop if the stop is supported by “reasonable  
8 suspicion.” *Morgan v. Woessner*, 997 F.2d 1244, 1252 (9th Cir. 1993) (citing *Terry v. Ohio*, 392  
9 U.S. 1, 20–22 (1968)). Moreover, police may arrest a citizen if they have “probable cause” to  
10 believe he committed a crime. *Id.* Plett argues that he had probable cause to believe that plaintiff  
11 was committing a crime because plaintiff does not dispute that on January 15, 2013, a sheriff’s  
12 deputy observed plaintiff take photographs of the security checkpoint at the Family Courthouse.  
13 *See* Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 4; Dkt. No.449 at 6-7. While plaintiff argues that taking photographs *outside* a  
14 courtroom does not violate California Rule of Court 1.150, Dkt. No. 449 at 7, plaintiff does not  
15 dispute that taking photographs of a security checkpoint in the courthouse violates Santa Clara  
16 County Superior Court General Rule 2B. Based on the undisputed factual record, Plett had  
17 probable cause to believe that plaintiff committed a crime by taking unauthorized photographs,  
18 and thus Plett did not violate the Fourth Amendment when he detained plaintiff for questioning.  
19 Moreover, for the reasons discussed above with respect to the April 16, 2012 incidents, Plett did  
20 not violate the Fourth Amendment by seizing plaintiff’s phone on January 15, 2013.

21 Plaintiff’s opposition brief alludes to an alleged admission by Plett that using a cell phone  
22 to record a crime at a courthouse would not violate court rules. Dkt. No. 449 at 7. However,

23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>4</sup> Plaintiff’s remaining arguments against qualified immunity are unpersuasive. Plaintiff cites  
26 defendants’ answer and plaintiff’s inadmissible summaries of defendant McChristian’s deposition  
27 testimony in support of the argument that defendants generally “were knowledgeable on the  
28 established rights.” Dkt. No. 449 at 14-15. Defendants’ subjective knowledge of rights is not at  
issue, however, because qualified immunity turns on “the objective legal reasonableness of the  
action.” *Pearson*, 555 U.S. at 244 (quotation marks omitted). Even if defendants’ subjective  
knowledge of constitutional law were relevant and plaintiff’s citations to uncertified deposition  
transcripts were admissible, the cited testimony does not support plaintiff’s argument.

1 plaintiff cites no authority suggesting that a “crime recording” exception exists to the Superior  
2 Court’s prohibition of photography and recording. Moreover, the deposition testimony plaintiff  
3 cites in support of his argument—even if it were admissible—only suggests that Plett believed it  
4 would be acceptable for a rape victim to record an attack at the courthouse, not that it was legal for  
5 plaintiff to take pictures of the security checkpoint. *See* Dkt. No. 439 Ex. I at 10:23-12:18  
6 (Hiramanek’s unofficial transcript of Plett’s deposition).

7 With respect to the deletion of photos, Plett’s sworn declaration indicates that plaintiff  
8 voluntarily deleted the photos of the security checkpoint at Plett’s request. Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 5.  
9 Plaintiff argues that the photos were involuntarily deleted, Dkt. No. 449 at 6-7, but plaintiff cites  
10 no admissible evidence in support of this argument. Even if Plett had searched plaintiff’s  
11 cellphone without his consent, however, and even if that search were unlawful, for the reasons  
12 described above with respect to the April 16, 2012 incidents, qualified immunity would shield  
13 Plett from liability. As explained above, the unlawfulness of searching a cellphone that was the  
14 instrument of a crime was not clearly established at the time of the alleged search in January 2013.

15 **c. June 8, 2012 Incidents**

16 Plaintiff alleges that on or about June 8, 2012, Plett allegedly ordered plaintiff to step away  
17 from a conversation Plett was having with a courthouse employee and sit in the corner of the  
18 Family Courthouse lobby under “show of authority” and “threat of arrest.” RSAC ¶ 119. The only  
19 evidence plaintiff offers in support of these allegations is a reference to paragraph 56 of plaintiff’s  
20 declaration, Dkt No. 439, which in turn cites to Hiranamek’s unofficial transcript of Plett’s  
21 deposition at pages 27:7–30:24. Even if the court were to consider this as evidence, it would not  
22 provide a sufficient basis to support plaintiff’s claims. The unofficial transcript indicates that Plett  
23 testified that he “asked” Hiranamek to step away from a conversation he was having regarding a  
24 third party’s confidential case file. *See* Dkt. No. 439 Ex. I at 28:19-22. Furthermore, according to  
25 plaintiff’s unofficial transcript, Plett answered “no” when he was asked whether he would have  
26 had plaintiff arrested for not moving away from the conversation. *Id.* at 30:9-11.

27 The court finds that the evidence of record does not support plaintiff’s claims and that  
28

1 summary judgment on Claim 10 in favor of Plett is appropriate.

2 **3. Claim 17 – McChristian and the June 11, 2012 Interrogation**

3 Plaintiff's claims against McChristian under Claim 17 of the RSAC arise from an incident  
4 on June 11, 2012 in which McChristian interrogated plaintiff at the Santa Clara County Superior  
5 Courthouse and a subsequent arrest of plaintiff by McChristian and Plett that is discussed below.  
6 McChristian seeks judgment on Claim 17 on the grounds: (1) that he did not violate plaintiff's  
7 constitutional rights; or, alternatively (2) that he is entitled to qualified immunity.

8 **a. Whether Plaintiff Was in Custody**

9 McChristian's main argument with respect to the June 11, 2012 interrogation is that no  
10 arrest occurred within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment that would trigger the requirements  
11 of *Miranda*. As the Ninth Circuit has explained, stops under the Fourth Amendment fall under  
12 three categories:

13 First, police may stop a citizen for questioning at any time, so long  
14 as that citizen recognizes that he or she is free to leave. Such brief,  
15 "consensual" exchanges need not be supported by any suspicion that  
16 the citizen is engaged in wrongdoing, and such stops are not  
17 considered seizures. Second, the police may "seize" citizens for  
brief, investigatory stops. This class of stops is not consensual, and  
such stops must be supported by "reasonable suspicion." Finally,  
police stops may be full-scale arrests. These stops, of course, are  
seizures, and must be supported by probable cause.

18 *Morgan v. Woessner*, 997 F.2d 1244, 1252 (9th Cir. 1993) (citations omitted). The U.S. Supreme  
19 Court has held that *Miranda* protections only come into play when "there is a 'formal arrest or  
20 restraint on freedom of movement' of the degree associated with a formal arrest." *California v.*  
21 *Beheler*, 463 U.S. 1121, 1125 (1983) (quoting *Oregon v. Mathiason*, 429 U.S. 492, 495 (1977)).

22 In this case, McChristian's declaration indicates that in early June 2012, McChristian was  
23 investigating accusations that plaintiff had signed an attorney's signature on court documents  
24 without the attorney's consent. Dkt. No. 432 ¶ 3. As part of McChristian's investigation, on June  
25 11, 2012, during a lunch recess in plaintiff's child custody trial, McChristian, who was  
26 accompanied by two other Sheriff's Department employees, Lamonde Davis and Michael Low,<sup>5</sup>

27  
28 <sup>5</sup> This court previously denied plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint to add Davis and Low as



1 asked plaintiff if he would speak with them about a few issues. *Id.* ¶ 4. McChristian’s account of  
2 what followed indicates that McChristian explicitly told Hirananeck that he was free to leave:

3 Hirananeck initially stated he was dealing with a civil court case. I  
4 told Hirananeck I only wanted a few minutes of his time to clear up a  
5 few allegations. Hirananeck walked with me, Davis and Low into  
6 Department 8, where we all sat at a table. Davis, Low, and I sat on  
7 one side of the table while Hirananeck sat by himself on the opposite  
8 side. I took out an audio voice recorder and informed Hirananeck I  
9 intended to record our conversation. Hirananeck refused, so I turned  
10 off the device. Hirananeck stated that he wanted someone else  
11 present and that he was going to walk out. ***I told Hirananeck he was***  
12 ***free to leave at any time.*** Hirananeck said he did not want to talk  
13 because he did not want to be ambushed. Davis and I told  
14 Hirananeck we wanted to talk to him about documents filed by him  
15 on behalf of multiple attorneys who said they did not sign them or  
16 agree to have him file them. Hirananeck again asked if the recording  
17 device was off because he would not talk if it was on. I showed him  
18 that it was off. Hirananeck said he wanted someone else present as a  
19 witness, but ***Hirananeck did not attempt to leave.*** Instead  
20 Hirananeck began asking questions about other subjects. He then  
21 spontaneously stated that he did not sign any documents. Sergeant  
22 Davis ended the conversation by telling Hirananeck that he should  
23 go have lunch and prepare for his civil case beginning at 1:30 p.m.

24 *Id.* (emphasis added). *See also* Dkt. No. 432-1 (police report of the June 11, 2012 questioning).

25 Plaintiff’s opposition brief does not point to any evidence disputing McChristian’s account  
26 of what happened. Plaintiff cites to various allegations in his complaint, Dkt. No. 449 at 16, but as  
27 noted above, allegations in a complaint do not constitute admissible evidence that can defeat a  
28 motion for summary judgment. In any event, while the cited paragraphs from the complaint  
*characterize* the facts as “coercion” or “overbearing tactics, force, threat, et al.,” plaintiff does not  
even allege that McChristian’s version of what was said or done on June 11, 2012 was incorrect.

Based on the undisputed record, the court finds that no constitutional violation occurred  
because plaintiff was not in custody on June 11, 2012, and thus that the deputies were not required  
to read plaintiff his *Miranda* warnings or provide him the opportunity to speak to an attorney. *See*  
*Mathiason*, 429 U.S. at 495 (holding that suspect who came voluntarily into police station, was  
informed that he was not under arrest, provided a half-hour interview in which he confessed to

---

defendants because, *inter alia*, plaintiff knew of their involvement in the June 11, 2012 incident  
for more than two years but waited until days before the dispositive motion deadline in this case to  
set a hearing on his motion to amend. Dkt. Nos. 424, 467.

1 burglary, and was then released, was not in custody such that *Miranda* warnings would be  
2 required).

3 **b. Qualified Immunity**

4 McChristian argues in the alternative that even if he was mistaken and a constitutional  
5 violation occurred on June 11, 2012, qualified immunity protects him from liability. The court  
6 agrees. More than thirty years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court noted that the question of “whether  
7 *Miranda* warnings are required if the suspect is not placed under arrest . . . has already been settled  
8 clearly.” *California v. Beheler*, 463 U.S. 1121, 1121-22 (1983). To the extent that plaintiff’s rights  
9 were violated, those rights were not clearly established.

10 At the hearing on the instant motions, plaintiff argued that the timing of the June 11, 2012  
11 interrogation, which occurred during a lunch break in plaintiff’s child custody trial, made the  
12 interrogation unconstitutionally coercive and that defendants should have known this. In support  
13 of his argument, plaintiff cited *Lynumn v. Illinois*, 372 U.S. 528 (1963) and *Haynes v. State of*  
14 *Washington*, 373 U.S. 503 (1963). Both of these cases can be readily distinguished, however, at  
15 least because in both cases the defendant was under arrest when the confession at issue occurred.<sup>6</sup>  
16 Defendants did not arrest plaintiff on June 11, 2012, nor is there any evidence that defendants  
17 attempted to use what plaintiff said against him in criminal proceedings. Moreover, unlike the  
18 plaintiff in *Lynumn*, Mr. Hiranek does not offer any evidence that defendants threatened to  
19 remove Mr. Hiranek’s children if he did not answer their questions on June 11, 2012.

20 McChristian is entitled to qualified immunity for the June 11, 2012 questioning because  
21 the questioning did not violate any of plaintiff’s clearly established rights.

22 **4. Claims 17 and 44 – Plett and McChristian and the June 29, 2012 Arrest**

23 Plaintiff’s remaining allegations against Plett and McChristian relate to plaintiff’s arrest  
24 pursuant to a warrant by Plett and McChristian at the Superior Courthouse on June 29, 2012.  
25 Plaintiff alleges that his arm was twisted as he was taken into custody, that he was asked questions  
26

---

27 <sup>6</sup> The other cases cited in plaintiff’s opposition brief, *see* Dkt. No. 449 at 17-18, are similarly  
28 distinguishable from the instant case because the cited cases involved interrogation of suspects  
who were in police custody.

1 without an attorney present, and that he was denied water and pain medication following root  
2 canal surgery. *See* RSAC ¶¶ 201-03, 1070-72. McChristian and Plett seek judgment on Claims 17  
3 and 44 on the grounds: (1) that they did not violate plaintiff’s *Miranda* rights and did not  
4 unconstitutionally deny plaintiff water and medications; or, alternatively (2) that they are entitled  
5 to qualified immunity.

6 **a. Questioning Without Attorney**

7 Defendants argue that, to the extent they asked plaintiff questions following his arrest, they  
8 did so (1) only after McChristian informed plaintiff of plaintiff’s *Miranda* rights; and (2) to collect  
9 non-investigatory booking information. Dkt. No. 430 at 18; Dkt. No. 432 ¶¶ 6-7; Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 7.  
10 McChristian and Plett declare that after they handcuffed plaintiff, McChristian advised plaintiff of  
11 his *Miranda* rights. Dt. No. 432 ¶ 6; Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 7. Plaintiff’s opposition brief claims that  
12 defendants’ motion “falsifies that *Miranda* rights was [sic] administered on Pltf.,” Dkt. No. 449 at  
13 17, but plaintiff cites no evidence in support of this allegation.

14 Under the “routine booking question” exception, even after an arrestee asserts the right to  
15 remain silent, law enforcement officials may ask questions to secure the “biographical data  
16 necessary to complete booking or pretrial services.” *Pennsylvania v. Muniz*, 496 U.S. 582, 601  
17 (1990); *see also United States v. Foster*, 227 F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir. 2000). McChristian and  
18 Plett declare that after they took plaintiff to a holding cell, while McChristian initially asked  
19 plaintiff investigative questions, after plaintiff indicated that he did not want to answer any  
20 questions, McChristian ceased asking investigative questions. Dkt. No. 432 ¶ 7; Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 8.  
21 Plett then asked plaintiff “biographical questions needed to fill out booking forms.” Dkt. No. 433  
22 ¶ 8. While plaintiff argues that he was questioned after saying that he did not want to talk, Dkt.  
23 No. 449 at 21, plaintiff does not cite any evidence of what questions he was asked, if any, beyond  
24 the administrative booking questions referenced by the deputies.

25 On these facts, even if McChristian and Plett had asked plaintiff some investigative  
26 questions after he invoked his right to remain silent, they would have been entitled to qualified  
27 immunity. With respect to the Fifth Amendment’s Self-Incrimination Clause, “[o]nly after a  
28

1 compelled incriminating statement is used in a criminal proceeding has an accused suffered the  
 2 requisite constitutional injury for purposes of a § 1983 action.” *Aguilera v. Baca*, 510 F.3d 1161,  
 3 1173 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing *Chavez v. Martinez*, 538 U.S. 760, 769 (2003) (plurality opinion)).  
 4 Hiranamek has submitted no evidence that defendants used any incriminating statements he made  
 5 following his June 29, 2012 arrest in a criminal proceeding against him. Moreover, while “[t]he  
 6 Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects against any government conduct that  
 7 ‘shocks the conscience,’” *Crowe v. County of San Diego*, 608 F.3d 406, 431 (9th Cir. 2010),  
 8 plaintiff has cited no authority for the proposition that merely asking investigatory questions meets  
 9 this high standard, particularly when the answers are not used against the arrestee. Accordingly,  
 10 qualified immunity would protect McChristian and Plett from liability.<sup>7</sup>

11 Based on the undisputed factual record presented to the court, the court finds that  
 12 McChristian and Plett did not violate plaintiff’s *Miranda* rights following the June 29, 2012 arrest.

13 **b. Excessive Force / Cruel and Unusual Punishment**

14 Finally, defendants argue that there is no evidence to suggest that they unconstitutionally  
 15 denied plaintiff water or pain medication following his arrest.<sup>8</sup> Dkt. No. 430 at 18-19. The parties  
 16 appear to agree that a deliberate indifference standard governs plaintiff’s claims that he was denied  
 17 water or pain medication. Dkt. No. 430 at 18; Dkt. No. 449 at 21. Plaintiff and defendants cite  
 18 *Farmer v. Brennan* for the proposition that a law enforcement official may be held liable under the  
 19 Eighth Amendment if the official “knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or  
 20 safety.” *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994). “[T]he official must both be aware of facts  
 21 from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must  
 22 also draw the inference.” *Id.* “Claims by pretrial detainees are analyzed under the Fourteenth  
 23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
 25 <sup>7</sup> Plaintiff also argues that McChristian and Plett did not advise him of the charges against him at  
 26 time of arrest. Dkt. No. 449 at 21. In support of this allegation, plaintiff cites his own unofficial  
 27 transcript of McChristian’s deposition. However, the cited transcript, even if it were admissible,  
 28 indicates that McChristian did eventually inform plaintiff of the charges against him. *See* Dkt. No.  
 439 Ex. J at 36:8-11 (Q: “And you didn’t tell me. You said we will tell you later.” / A: “I said to  
 you all the charges later. But the main charge is forgery.”).

<sup>8</sup> The court notes that defendants’ motion does not appear to seek summary judgment for  
 plaintiff’s claims of excessive force for Plett allegedly twisting plaintiff’s arm during arrest.

1 Amendment Due Process Clause, rather than under the Eighth Amendment.” *Frost v. Agnos*, 152  
2 F.3d 1124, 1128 (9th Cir. 1998). “Because pretrial detainees’ rights under the Fourteenth  
3 Amendment are comparable to prisoners’ rights under the Eighth Amendment, however, we apply  
4 the same standards.” *Id.*

5 McChristian and Plett argue that it is undisputed that they did not deny plaintiff water  
6 because they allowed plaintiff to stop at a drinking fountain at the time plaintiff was taken into  
7 custody. Dkt. No. 432 ¶ 6; Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 7. Plaintiff cites no evidence to dispute defendant’s  
8 declarations that plaintiff was allowed to drink from a drinking fountain at the time of arrest.  
9 Rather, plaintiff’s argument appears to be that he was not offered food or water later while he was  
10 in his holding cell. Plaintiff appears to start counting the time since he last had food or water from  
11 the night before he was arrested, when he was not yet in custody. *See* Dkt. No. 449 at 19 (asserting  
12 that plaintiff “had no food or water since 16 hours prior to his arrest and the whole day of the  
13 arrest”). Moreover, plaintiff has presented no evidence that he asked McChristian or Plett for food.  
14 The court also notes that plaintiff’s complaint alleges that plaintiff “was prescribed pain killing  
15 medication and asked to be off food for 24 hours” following a root canal. RSAC ¶ 1066. Plaintiff’s  
16 summary judgment briefs cite no evidence to show how long he was held, and thus the court is  
17 unable to determine whether plaintiff was even in custody when this 24-hour period expired. On  
18 this record, the court concludes that plaintiff has not presented a prima facie case that McChristian  
19 or Plett showed deliberate indifference by not ensuring plaintiff had food or water.

20 As for plaintiff’s allegation that he was denied pain medication following a root canal,  
21 McChristian and Plett declare that they did not know plaintiff needed pain medication or that he  
22 had any on his person. Dkt. No. 432 ¶ 6; Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 7. Plaintiff’s only cited evidence that  
23 defendants actually knew he wanted pain medication is an “admission” in defendants’ motion in  
24 which defendants state that they “knew that Hiranamek was thirsty and wanted water due to pain  
25 medications he allegedly took for a dental procedure *the night before*.” Dkt. No. 449 at 21 (citing  
26 Dkt. No. 430 at 19) (emphasis added). The court finds that the quoted text does not show that  
27 defendants knew that plaintiff was requesting pain medication while he was in custody or that he  
28

1 had any pain medication on his person. Even if knowledge of plaintiff’s root canal the previous  
2 evening might allow McChristian and Plett to infer that plaintiff might request additional pain  
3 medication, plaintiff has provided no analysis for why that the failure to take pain medication  
4 exposed him to “substantial risk of serious harm.” Moreover, plaintiff has presented no evidence  
5 that McChristian or Plett actually drew the inference that plaintiff was in need of pain medication.  
6 To the contrary, both defendants submitted un rebutted declarations indicating that plaintiff did not  
7 ask for pain medication or appear to be in pain when he was in their custody. Dkt. No. 432 ¶ 6;  
8 Dkt. No. 433 ¶ 7. The court finds that plaintiff has not presented sufficient evidence to defeat  
9 summary judgment on his claim that he was unconstitutionally denied medication. Moreover,  
10 because plaintiff has not shown that the lack of pain medication violated a constitutional right,  
11 McChristian and Plett are entitled to qualified immunity.

12 Accordingly, McChristian’s and Plett’s motion for partial summary judgment on claim 44  
13 is granted.

14 **D. Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment Against the Deputies**

15 Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the merits of his claims against the sheriff’s  
16 deputies. Dkt. No. 438 at 7-9. The analysis above explains why plaintiff’s arguments on the merits  
17 of his claims are unpersuasive. Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on two additional grounds.

18 First, plaintiff argues that he is entitled to summary judgment (and that defendants are not  
19 entitled to summary judgment) due to alleged “discovery disobedience” by defendants and their  
20 counsel. *See* Dkt. No. 438 at 4-6; Dkt. No. 449 at 23. Plaintiff’s arguments rely on various  
21 discovery motions that plaintiff previously filed and that the assigned magistrate judge in this case  
22 subsequently denied. *See* Dkt. No. 451. Moreover, contrary to plaintiff’s suggestion, it is  
23 undisputed that plaintiff was eventually able to obtain deposition testimony from Plett. *See, e.g.,*  
24 Dkt. No. 449 at 6-7 (citing Plett’s deposition testimony). Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment  
25 as a discovery sanction is denied.

26 Second, plaintiff moves for summary judgment on defendants’ affirmative defenses. Dkt.  
27 No. 438 at 5-6. Because the court finds that plaintiff has not met his burden of proof, the court  
28

1 need not decide whether the defendants proffered sufficient evidence in support of their remaining  
2 affirmative defenses.

3 **III. ORDER**

4 For the reasons explained above, defendants' motion for partial summary judgment, Dkt.  
5 No. 430 is GRANTED. Plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment, Dkt. No. 438, is  
6 DENIED. Of the claims plaintiff asserted against McChristian, Plett, and Polumbus, the court  
7 understands that the only claim that remains in this case is plaintiff's allegation under Claim 44  
8 that Plett used excessive force by twisting plaintiff's arm during his arrest on June 29, 2012.

9 A case management conference will be held on Friday, September 16 at 10:30 a.m. in  
10 courtroom #6, 4th floor of the U.S. Courthouse, 280 South First Street, San Jose, California to set  
11 an appropriate schedule for the pretrial conference and trial of the remaining excessive force claim  
12 against Plett. Subject to input from the parties, the court tentatively believes that the trial of the  
13 claim against Plett should commence on or about October 11, 2016. The parties shall file a Joint  
14 Case Management Statement by September 9, 2016.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: September 1, 2016

17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Ronald M. Whyte  
20 United States District Judge

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28