

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 14-cv-00242-BNB

ANDREA HAMMOND, J.D.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ICCS (Intervention Community Correction Services),
GREG KILDOW, ICCS CEO,
ALL BOARD MEMBERS OF ICCS,
JEFF GEIST,
GERI ANNA, Last Name Unknown, Case Manager at ICCS),
SUSAN KELLER, Parole Officer,
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, and
STATE OF COLORADO,

Defendants.

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Andrea Hammond, is in the custody of the Colorado Department of Corrections at the La Vista Correctional Facility in Pueblo, Colorado. On January 28, 2014, Plaintiff filed *pro se* a Prisoner Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 but did not use a proper Court-approved form. Pursuant to the Court's January 28, 2014 Order directing Plaintiff to cure certain deficiencies, she submitted her claims on a proper form on February 26, 2014.

The Court must construe Plaintiff's February 26 Complaint liberally because she is not represented by an attorney. See *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972); *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991). However, the Court cannot act as an advocate for a *pro se* litigant. See *Hall*, 935 F.2d at 1110. Plaintiff will be directed to file an Amended Complaint for the following reasons.

The twin purposes of a complaint are to give the opposing parties fair notice of the basis for the claims against them so that they may respond and to allow the Court to conclude that the allegations, if proven, show that the plaintiff is entitled to relief. See *Monument Builders of Greater Kansas City, Inc. v. American Cemetery Ass'n of Kansas*, 891 F.2d 1473, 1480 (10th Cir. 1989). The requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 are designed to meet these purposes. See *TV Communications Network, Inc. v. ESPN, Inc.*, 767 F. Supp. 1062, 1069 (D. Colo. 1991), *aff'd*, 964 F.2d 1022 (10th Cir. 1992). Rule 8(a) provides that a complaint “must contain (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction, . . . (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and (3) a demand for the relief sought.” The philosophy of Rule 8(a) is reinforced by Rule 8(d)(1), which provides that “[e]ach allegation must be simple, concise, and direct.” Taken together, Rules 8(a) and (d)(1) underscore the emphasis placed on clarity and brevity by the federal pleading rules. Prolix, vague, or unintelligible pleadings violate Rule 8.

Claims must be presented clearly and concisely in a manageable format that allows a court and a defendant to know what claims are being asserted and to be able to respond to those claims. *New Home Appliance Ctr., Inc., v. Thompson*, 250 F.2d 881, 883 (10th Cir. 1957). For the purposes of Rule 8(a), “[i]t is sufficient, and indeed all that is permissible, if the complaint concisely states facts upon which relief can be granted upon any legally sustainable basis.” *Id.*

Plaintiff’s claims are not organized in a manner that allows the Court and defendants to determine the supporting facts for each of his claims. Plaintiff, for the most part, fails to identify, clearly and concisely, the defendants she is suing with respect to each asserted claim and what each named defendant did that allegedly

violated her rights. Plaintiff's Complaint includes repetitive and prolix factual allegations and unnecessary legal argument and asserts claims against individuals not named as parties to the action.

Furthermore, Defendants Colorado Department of Corrections and the State of Colorado are improper parties to this action. The State of Colorado and its entities are protected by Eleventh Amendment immunity. See *Will v. Michigan Dep't of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 66 (1989); *Meade v. Grubbs*, 841 F.2d 1512, 1525-26 (10th Cir. 1988). "It is well established that absent an unmistakable waiver by the state of its Eleventh Amendment immunity, or an unmistakable abrogation of such immunity by Congress, the amendment provides absolute immunity from suit in federal courts for states and their agencies." *Ramirez v. Oklahoma Dep't of Mental Health*, 41 F.3d 584, 588 (10th Cir. 1994), *overruled on other grounds by Ellis v. University of Kansas Med. Ctr.*, 163 F.3d 1186 (10th Cir. 1998). The State of Colorado has not waived its Eleventh Amendment immunity, see *Griess v. Colorado*, 841 F.2d 1042, 1044-45 (10th Cir. 1988), and congressional enactment of § 1983 did not abrogate Eleventh Amendment immunity, see *Quern v. Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332, 340-345 (1979).

To state a claim in federal court Plaintiff must explain (1) what a named defendant did to her; (2) when the defendant did it; (3) how the defendant's action harmed her; and (4) what specific legal right the defendant violated. *Nasious v. Two Unknown B.I.C.E. Agents*, 492 F.3d 1158, 1163 (10th Cir. 2007).

Plaintiff also must assert personal participation by each named defendant in the alleged constitutional violation. See *Bennett v. Passic*, 545 F.2d 1260, 1262-63 (10th Cir. 1976). To establish personal participation, Plaintiff must show how each named individual caused the deprivation of a federal right. See *Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S.

159, 166 (1985). There must be an affirmative link between the alleged constitutional violation and each defendant's participation, control or direction, or failure to supervise. See *Butler v. City of Norman*, 992 F.2d 1053, 1055 (10th Cir. 1993). A defendant may not be held liable for the unconstitutional conduct of his or her subordinates on a theory of respondeat superior. See *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 676 (2009). Furthermore,

when a plaintiff sues an official under *Bivens* or § 1983 for conduct "arising from his or her superintendent responsibilities," the plaintiff must plausibly plead and eventually prove not only that the official's subordinates violated the Constitution, but that the official by virtue of his own conduct and state of mind did so as well.

Dodds v. Richardson, 614 F.3d 1185, 1198 (10th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 677). To succeed in a § 1983 suit against a government official for conduct that arises out of his or her supervisory responsibilities, a plaintiff must allege and demonstrate that: "(1) the defendant promulgated, created, implemented or possessed responsibility for the continued operation of a policy that (2) caused the complained of constitutional harm, and (3) acted with the state of mind required to establish the alleged constitutional deprivation." *Id.* at 1199.

A decision to dismiss a complaint pursuant to Rule 8 is within the trial court's sound discretion. See *Atkins v. Northwest Airlines, Inc.*, 967 F.2d 1197, 1203 (8th Cir. 1992); *Gillibeau v. City of Richmond*, 417 F.2d 426, 431 (9th Cir. 1969). This Court, however, will give Plaintiff an opportunity to cure the deficiencies in the Complaint by submitting an Amended Complaint that meets the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.

Plaintiff also must identify each defendant under the Parties section of the Prisoner Complaint form and provide an address for the named defendant in this section. Plaintiff also is not required to submit a copy of the Prisoner Complaint, only

the original is needed. Finally, the Prisoner Complaint does not comply with the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, which require that all papers presented for filing be legible and double-spaced and include appropriate margins. See D.C.COLO.LCivR 10.1. Because the Prisoner Complaint lacks adequate margins and spacing between lines, it is difficult to read and understand. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that **within thirty days from the date of this Order**, Plaintiff shall file an Amended Complaint that complies with this Order. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall obtain the Court-approved Prisoner Complaint form (with the assistance of his case manager or the facility's legal assistant), along with the applicable instructions, at www.cod.uscourts.gov. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff fails to file an Amended Complaint that complies with this Order within the time allowed, and to the Court's satisfaction, the Court will dismiss the Complaint and the action without further notice.

DATED March 3, 2014, at Denver, Colorado.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Boyd N. Boland
United States Magistrate Judge