

10cv2362 WQH (BLM)

§ 1915A. See Jan. 12, 2011 Order at 4. Plaintiff was granted leave to file an Amended 2 Complaint in order to correct the deficiencies identified by the Court. Id. Plaintiff was also 3 cautioned that Defendants not named in the Amended Complaint will be deemed to have been waived. Id. (citing King v. Ativeh, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987). 4

## II.

## SUA SPONTE SCREENING PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)

7 As the Court stated in its previous Order, the Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA"), 8 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, obligates the Court to review complaints filed by anyone "incarcerated or 9 detained in any facility who is accused of, sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, 10 violations of criminal law or the terms or conditions of parole, probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program," "as soon as practicable after docketing" and regardless of whether the 11 prisoner prepays filing fees or moves to proceed in forma pauperis. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), 12 (c). The Court must sua sponte dismiss prisoner complaints, or any portions thereof, which are 13 frivolous, malicious, or fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 14 1915A(b); Resnick v. Hayes, 213 F.3d 443, 446-47 (9th Cir. 2000). 15

16 In his First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff no longer names Kernan, Neotti, Morris, Brandt, Norman, Choo, Schwarzenegger, Romero, Kelso or Seeley as Defendants. Thus, any 17 18 claims against those Defendants have been waived. See King, 814 F.2d at 567. Those 19 Defendants are **DISMISSED** from this action.

20 As to the remaining claims against the remaining two Defendants, the Court finds 21 Plaintiff's allegations sufficient to survive the sua sponte screening required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).<sup>1</sup> However, because Plaintiff is not proceeding *in forma pauperis*, he is *not* entitled 22 23 to U.S. Marshal service on his behalf. Plaintiff is responsible for effecting proper service on 24 Defendants Marrero and Suglich. If Plaintiff fails to properly serve these Defendants within 120 25 days from the date this Order is filed, the Court will dismiss this action pursuant to FED.R.CIV.P. 4(m). 26

27

1

5

6

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is cautioned that "the sua sponte screening and dismissal procedure is cumulative of, 28 and not a substitute for, any subsequent Rule 12[] motion that [a defendant] may choose to bring.' *Teahan v. Wilhelm*, 481 F. Supp. 2d 1115, 1119 (S.D. Cal. 2007).

1	III.
2	CONCLUSION AND ORDER
3	Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
4	(1) Defendants Kernan, Neotti, Morris, Brandt, Norman, Choo, Schwarzenegger,
5	Romero, Kelso or Seeley are <b>DISMISSED</b> from this action. The Clerk of Court is directed to
6	terminate these Defendants from the docket.
7	(2) The Clerk of Court is further directed to issue a summons as to Plaintiff's First
8	Amended Complaint upon Defendants Marrero and Suglich and shall forward it to Plaintiff.
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.
10	DATED: April 11, 2011
11	William 2. Vayes
12	WILLIAM Q. HAYES United States District Judge
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	K:\COMMON\EVERYONE\EFILE-PROSE\WQH\10cv2362-dsm Defs & issue summons.wpd 3 10cv2362 WQH (BLM)