Sandoval v. I	Lewis et al	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		TATES DISTRICT COLUT
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	FOR THE NORTHERN	N DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	ALFRED ARTHUR SANDOVAL,) No. C 16-0460 LHK (PR)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER OF SERVICE; DIRECTING DEFENDANTS TO
13	v.) FILE DISPOSITIVE MOTION OR) NOTICE REGARDING SUCH) MOTION
14	G. LEWIS, et al.,	
15	Defendants.))
16	Plaintiff, a California state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> , filed a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis in a separate order.	
17		
18	For the reasons stated below, the court orders service upon defendants, and directs defendants to	
19	file a dispositive motion or notice regarding such motion.	
20	DISCUSSION	
21	A. <u>Standard of Review</u>	
22 23	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. <i>See</i> 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	
24		
25		
26		
seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from s		s immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C.
28	§ 1915A(b)(1), (2). Pro se pleadings must, however, be liberally construed. See Balistreri v.	
	Order of Service; Directing Defendants to File Disport P:\PRO-SE\LHK\CR.16\Sandoval460srv.wpd	sitive Motion or Notice Regarding Such Motion

Doc. 4

Pacifica Police Dep't., 901 F.2d 696, 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).

B. Legal Claims

Plaintiff alleges that defendants knowingly housed him in the same section of the Secured Housing Unit with a known and documented enemy. In addition, plaintiff states that on February 1, 2014, Officer Westerman, the control booth officer, opened plaintiff's cell door, releasing him from his cell at a time when plaintiff's documented enemy had also been released and was in the yard. When plaintiff was close to the yard, plaintiff was attacked. Prison officials attempted to stop the attack, and as a result, plaintiff was shot by a 40 mm launcher and sprayed with pepper spray.

Liberally construed, plaintiff has stated cognizable claims that defendants were deliberately indifferent to his safety, in violation of the Eighth Amendment

CONCLUSION

- 1. The clerk of the court shall mail a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service of Summons, two copies of the Waiver of Service of Summons, a copy of the complaint and all attachments thereto (docket no. 1), and a copy of this order to Former Warden G.

 Lewis, Associate Warden Dave Barneburg, Sgt. Jeremy Frisk, and Correctional Officer Robert Westerman, at Pelican Bay State Prison. The clerk of the court shall also mail a courtesy copy of the complaint and a copy of this order to the California Attorney General's Office. Additionally, the clerk shall mail a copy of this order to plaintiff.
- 2. Defendants are cautioned that Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires them to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint. Pursuant to Rule 4, if defendants, after being notified of this action and asked by the court, on behalf of plaintiff, to waive service of the summons, fail to do so, they will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for their failure to sign and return the waiver

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 3. No later than sixty (60) days from the date the waivers are sent from the court, defendants shall file a motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion with respect to the cognizable claims in the complaint. 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 defendants are of the opinion that this case cannot be resolved by summary judgment, they shall so inform the court prior to the date the summary judgment motion is due.
- 4. Plaintiff's opposition to the dispositive motion shall be filed with the court and served on defendants no later than **twenty-eight (28) days** from the date defendants' motion is filed. 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 evidence showing triable issues of material fact on every essential element of his claim).
- 5. Defendants shall file a reply brief no later than **fourteen (14) days** after plaintiff's opposition is filed.
- 6. 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.
- 7. All communications by the plaintiff with the court must be served on defendants or defendants' counsel, by mailing a true copy of the document to defendants or defendants'

counsel. 8. Discovery may be taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. No further court order is required before the parties may conduct discovery. 9. It is plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the court and all parties 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). IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: <u>4/7/2</u>016 United States District Judge