

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Michael E. Clark,

Plaintiff

v.

Adrian Guerrero,

Defendant

Case No.: 2:09-cv-00141-JAD-BNW

Order Setting Evidentiary Hearing

More than a decade ago, pro se plaintiff Michael Clark brought two lawsuits against prison officials who he claimed either assaulted or retaliated against him.¹ Those cases were eventually consolidated² before District Court Judge James C. Mahan and screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915,³ resulting in an Eighth Amendment excessive-force claim against defendant Adrian Guerrero for pushing Clark and forcing him to stay in administrative segregation.⁴ After entering a default judgment against Guerrero, Judge Mahan determined that Clark's compensatory- and punitive-damages demand was excessive and unsupported, and awarded him a dollar in nominal damages.⁵ The Ninth Circuit vacated that decision and remanded it for further consideration, directing Judge Mahan to hold an evidentiary hearing to assess the extent of Clark's damages.⁶

¹ ECF No. 1.

² ECF No. 80.

³ ECF No. 102.

⁴ *Id.* at 5.

⁵ ECF No. 155 at 1–2.

⁶ ECF No. 160 at 2.

1 and \$3 million in punitive damages against Guerrero. So any award for Clark is capped at \$4
2 million in total damages and must be supported by evidentiary proof.¹²

3 **I. Compensatory damages**

4 To be awarded compensatory damages, Clark must prove that any injuries he sustained
5 were caused by Guerrero’s excessive force. “[T]he basic purpose’ of § 1983 damages is ‘to
6 compensate persons for injuries that are caused by the deprivation of constitutional rights.’”¹³
7 To recover under § 1983, a plaintiff must demonstrate an “actual injury” that is “caused by the
8 denial of his constitutional rights.”¹⁴ Clark argues that the altercation resulted in knee, back, and
9 head injuries.¹⁵ While Clark provides documentation of various treatments he’s received over
10 the last couple of years, those documents fail to tie the underlying injuries to Guerrero’s conduct.
11 So at the hearing, Clark must be prepared to offer additional evidence or testimony that those
12 injuries happened *because Guerrero tackled him*. He must also be able to explain why he is
13 entitled to millions of dollars for those injuries and his emotional distress. Just as a benchmark, a
14 typical damages award is about three times the value of a person’s medical bills. And, as United
15 States Supreme Court Justice Sotomayor pointed out in *Murphy v. Smith*, the “median judgment”
16 in a successful prisoner-civil-rights case in 2012 was \$4,185, up from \$1,000 in 1993.¹⁶ So
17 modest judgments are “the norm” in cases like this.¹⁷

18
19
20 ¹² Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(c) (“A default judgment must not differ in kind from, or exceed in amount,
what is demanded in the pleadings.”).

21 ¹³ *Memphis Cmty. Sch. Dist. v. Stachura*, 477 U.S. 299, 307 (1986) (citation omitted).

22 ¹⁴ *Id.* (citation omitted).

¹⁵ ECF No. 149 at 2.

23 ¹⁶ *Murphy v. Smith*, 138 S. Ct. 784, 793 (2018) (Sotomayor, J., dissenting).

¹⁷ *Id.*

1 **II. Punitive damages on default judgment**

2 Clark’s punitive-damages request presents a steep hill to climb. To receive punitive
3 damages on default judgment, Clark must provide evidence that Guerrero’s actions were “driven
4 by evil motive or intent” or that his conduct “involved a reckless or callous indifference” to
5 Clark’s “constitutional rights.”¹⁸ **On default judgment, conduct that may give rise to**
6 **punitive damages is not presumed**; Clark must offer independent evidence to corroborate those
7 facts.¹⁹ So if Clark intends to ask for an award of punitive damages, he must also offer evidence
8 of Guerrero’s malice, recklessness, and indifference at the hearing.

9 **Conclusion**

10 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that an **evidentiary hearing** to determine the amount of
11 damages, if any, that Clark is entitled to on default judgment, **is set for May 25, 2021, at**
12 **10:00 am. That hearing will take place in Courtroom 6D of the Lloyd D. George**
13 **Courthouse.** The parties and participants will be required to wear a mask and follow all
14 COVID-related protocols under this court’s Amended Temporary General Order 2020-08.

15
16 
17 _____
18 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey
19 April 6, 2021
20
21
22

23 ¹⁸ *Morgan v. Woessner*, 997 F.2d 1244, 1254 (9th Cir. 1993) (citation omitted).

¹⁹ *Matter of Gober*, 100 F.3d 1195, 1205 (5th Cir. 1996).