

FILED

JUN 20 2013

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

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

11 TONY D. LEE,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 MEDICAL STAFF, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. C 13-01434 EJD (PR)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

17
18 Plaintiff, a California prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights complaint
19 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. For the reasons discussed below, this case is DISMISSED
20 without prejudice for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.
21

22 **DISCUSSION**

23 The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321
24 (1996) (“PLRA”) provides: “No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions
25 under [42 U.S.C. § 1983], or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail,
26 prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are
27 exhausted.” 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). Exhaustion is mandatory and not left to the discretion
28 of the district court. Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 84 (2006). Exhaustion is a

1 prerequisite to all prisoner lawsuits concerning prison life, whether such actions involve
2 general conditions or particular episodes, whether they allege excessive force or some
3 other wrong, and even if they seek relief not available in grievance proceedings, such as
4 money damages. Porter v. Nussle, 534 U.S. 516, 524 (2002). All available remedies
5 must be exhausted; those remedies “need not meet federal standards, nor must they be
6 ‘plain, speedy, and effective.’” Id. (citation omitted). Even when the prisoner seeks relief
7 not available in grievance proceedings, notably money damages, exhaustion is a
8 prerequisite to suit. Id.; Booth v. Churner, 532 U.S. 731, 741 (2001). Prisoners cannot
9 avoid the administrative exhaustion requirement by requesting relief not available in the
10 appeals system, such as monetary relief, or by simply declaring the process futile. The
11 exhaustion requirement requires “proper exhaustion” of all available administrative
12 remedies. Ngo, 548 U.S. at 93. Because exhaustion under § 1997e(a) is an affirmative
13 defense, a complaint may be dismissed for failure to exhaust only if failure to exhaust is
14 obvious from the face of the complaint and/or any attached exhibits. Wyatt v. Terhune,
15 315 F.3d 1108, 1119-20 (9th Cir. 2003). The Court may dismiss a complaint for failure
16 to exhaust where the prisoner “conce[des] to nonexhaustion” and “no exception to
17 exhaustion applies.” Id. at 1120.

18 Here, Plaintiff indicated on the complaint that the last level to which he appealed –
19 i.e., the informal level – was not the highest level of appeal available to him. (Compl. at
20 2.) Plaintiff must comply with the PLRA’s requirement of “proper exhaustion” under
21 Ngo: “Proper exhaustion demands compliance with an agency’s deadlines and other
22 critical procedural rules because no adjudicative system can function effectively without
23 imposing some orderly structure on the course of its proceedings.” 548 U.S. at 90-91
24 (footnote omitted). As it is clear that Plaintiff has not “properly exhausted” his claims by
25 pursuing all levels of administrative review available to him, and there is no applicable
26 exception to the exhaustion requirement, dismissal without prejudice is appropriate.

27 ///


28 ///

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, this action is hereby DISMISSED, without prejudice to
3 Plaintiff's refiling his claim after all available administrative remedies have been
4 exhausted.

5 The Clerk shall terminate any pending motions and close the file.

6
7 DATED: 6/20/13

8 
9 _____
10 EDWARD J. DAVILA
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TONY DOMINGO LEE,
Plaintiff,

Case Number: CV13-01434 EJD

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

v.

MEDICAL STAFF, et al.,
Defendants.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on 6/20/13, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Tony Domingo Lee
133 Shipley St. #W102
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dated: 6/20/13

Richard W. Wiering, Clerk
By: Elizabeth Garcia, Deputy Clerk

