1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	TONY JOHN WAYNE,	CASE NO. 07 CV 1605 JM (BLM)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER:
13	VS.	1) ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION and 2) DENVING MOTION FOR
14		2) DENYING MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT
15	O. LEAL et al.,	Doc. Nos. 68, 70, 76, 80, 82, 86
16	Defendants.	
17	Tony John Wayne ("Plaintiff"), a former state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma	
18	pauperis, filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants moved to dismiss	
19	Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 37) on January 9, 2009. (Doc. No. 68.) Plaintiff	
20	filed no opposition to the motion. Also pending before the court are Plaintiff's motion for summary	
20	filed no opposition to the motion. Also pending	before the court are Plaintiff's motion for summary
20 21		before the court are Plaintiff's motion for summary end (Doc. No. 76), and motion for entry of default
21	judgment (Doc. Nos. 70 and 80), motion to ame	
21 22	judgment (Doc. Nos. 70 and 80), motion to ame	
21 22 23	judgment (Doc. Nos. 70 and 80), motion to ame (Doc. No. 82). // <u>Report and Recommendation</u>	
21 22 23 24	judgment (Doc. Nos. 70 and 80), motion to ame (Doc. No. 82). // <u>Report and Recommendation</u> On June 2, 2009, Magistrate Judge Barba	end (Doc. No. 76), and motion for entry of default
 21 22 23 24 25 	judgment (Doc. Nos. 70 and 80), motion to ame (Doc. No. 82). // <u>Report and Recommendation</u> On June 2, 2009, Magistrate Judge Barba (Doc. No. 86, "R&R") denying Plaintiff's motion	end (Doc. No. 76), and motion for entry of default ara L. Major issued a Report and Recommendation
 21 22 23 24 25 26 	judgment (Doc. Nos. 70 and 80), motion to ame (Doc. No. 82). // <u>Report and Recommendation</u> On June 2, 2009, Magistrate Judge Barba (Doc. No. 86, "R&R") denying Plaintiff's motion	end (Doc. No. 76), and motion for entry of default ara L. Major issued a Report and Recommendation to amend and recommending this court: 1) grant in miss; and 2) deny Plaintiff's motion for summary

07cv1605

Having carefully considered the thorough and thoughtful R&R, the record before the court, 2 and the applicable authorities, the court wholly **ADOPTS THE R&R**.

3

4

//

1

Motion for Entry of Default

5 On January 16, 2009, Plaintiff filed a motion for entry of default. (Doc. No. 82.) Plaintiff 6 asserted entry of default was proper because Defendants had not responded to the Second Amended 7 Complaint within 20 days after service. However, Defendants waived service pursuant to Rule 4(d) 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and thus, no response was due until December 26, 2008. (See 9 Doc. Nos. 55-62.) The court granted Defendants an extension of time to respond to January 9, 2009. 10 (Doc. No. 67.) Defendants filed their motion to dismiss on this date. Plaintiff's motion for entry of 11 default is therefore **DENIED**.

12

//

13 Conclusion

14 Based on the foregoing, the court hereby adopts the findings and recommendations of the 15 R&R. Accordingly, the court GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART Defendants' motion to 16 dismiss. Plaintiff's § 1983 claims for retaliation and falsified incident reports or withheld evidence 17 are **DISMISSED** without prejudice and with leave to amend. Plaintiff's state law assault and battery 18 claim is **DISMISSED** with prejudice. Plaintiff's allegations of vulgar or abusive language will be 19 considered in the context of his § 1983 claim for excessive force. To the extent Plaintiff seeks 20 monetary damages against Defendants acting in their official capacities, such claims are DISMISSED 21 with prejudice. In addition, as recommended by Magistrate Judge Major, the court **DENIES** 22 Plaintiff's motion to amend (Doc. No. 76) and motion for summary judgment (Doc. Nos. 70 and 80). 23

24

For the reasons stated above, the court also **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for entry of default (Doc. No. 82).

25 Plaintiff is granted leave to file a third amended complaint consistent with this order. See 26 Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1128 (9th Cir. 2000) (dismissal of pro se complaint for failure to state 27 claim is proper only where obvious that amendment would be futile). If Plaintiff wishes to file a third 28 amended complaint, he must do so by September 4, 2009. If Plaintiff does not file an third amended

1	complaint by that date, the case will proceed on his § 1983 excessive force claim and Defendants are	
2	instructed to answer in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.	
3	DATED: August 4, 2000	
4	DATED: August 4, 2009	
5	Hon. Jeffrey T. Miller United States District Judge	
6	Ginted States District Judge	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
24 25		
23 26		
20		
27		
20		