

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Michael Schaefer,
Plaintiff

v.

Barbara Cegavsky, Secretary of State, et al.,
Defendants

2:16-cv-00004-JAD-VCF

**Order Adopting Report and
Recommendation, Dismissing
Complaint without Prejudice, and
Denying All Pending Motions as Moot**

[ECF 2, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18]

10 Pro se plaintiff Michael Schaefer sues Nevada's Secretary of State and other individuals
11 claiming that NRS § 293.263 violates the equal-protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.¹
12 On January 11, 2016, Magistrate Judge Cam Ferenbach granted Schaefer's IFP application, screened
13 his complaint under 28 USC § 1915(e), and recommended that I dismiss Schaefer's complaint for
14 failure to state a claim.² Schaefer objects.³ Having reviewed the objected-to portions of Magistrate
15 Judge Ferenbach's report and recommendation de novo, I overrule Schaefer's objections, adopt the
16 report and recommendation in its entirety, dismiss Schaefer's complaint without prejudice, deny all
17 other pending motions as moot, and give Schaefer until April 15, 2016, to file an amended complaint
18 if he can state a plausible claim for relief..

19 **Discussion**

20 **A. Standards of review**

21 A district court reviews objections to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and
22 recommendations *de novo*.⁴ "The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommendation,

23
24
25 ¹ ECF 3.

26 ² ECF 2.

27 ³ ECF 7.

28 ⁴ *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2003).

1 receive further evidence, or resubmit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.”⁵ The
2 standard of review applied to the unobjected-to portions of the report and recommendation is left to
3 the district judge’s discretion.⁶ Local Rule IB 3-2(b) requires de novo consideration of specific
4 objections only.⁷

5 **B. Screening under § 1915(e)**

6 Section 1915 governs proceedings *in forma pauperis*, and directs a court to dismiss a case at
7 any time the court determines that the allegation of poverty is untrue or that the action is frivolous or
8 malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a
9 defendant who is immune from that relief.⁸ Pro se pleadings, however, must be liberally construed.⁹

10 Dismissal of a complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted is
11 permitted by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), and the court applies the same standard under
12 § 1915 when reviewing the adequacy of a pro se complaint. But when a court dismisses a complaint
13 under § 1915(e), the plaintiff should be given leave to amend the complaint with directions for
14 curing its deficiencies, unless it is clear from the face of the complaint that the deficiencies could not
15 be cured by amendment.¹⁰

16 **C. Schaefer fails to plead a plausible claim for relief.**

17 Schaefer alleges that NRS § 293.263, which requires that “the major political party
18 designation must appear the names of candidates grouped alphabetically under the title and length of
19 term of the partisan office for which those candidates filed,” denies “Equal Protection of the Law to

20
21 ⁵ *Id.*

22 ⁶ *Id.* at 1121–22 (a “district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations
23 *de novo if objection is made*, but not otherwise.”) (emphasis in original).

24 ⁷ See Nevada L.R. IB 3-2(b) (requiring *de novo* consideration of specific objections only); *Carillo v.*
25 *Cate*, 2009 WL 2575888, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 17, 2009) (noting that “generalized objections” do
not require *de novo* review).

26 ⁸ 28 USC § 1915(e)(2).

27 ⁹ *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

28 ¹⁰ See *Cato v. United States*, 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995).

1 all candidates not listed first.”¹¹ In support, Schaefer alleges that “neither [winner of a recent
2 California municipal primary] of which would have won in the primary election if buried down-
3 ballot” and that “[t]here is an advantage of between 2% and 20% favoring the first listed candidate
4 on any ballot list.”¹² Judge Ferenbach found that Schaefer’s allegations do not state a plausible claim
5 for relief. I agree.

6 Schaefer objects by questioning the applicability of *Iqbal* to this case and asserting that “all
7 any Court has to do to recognize prejudice” is “to look at [a] list of Legislators in alphabet-states . . .
8 , and note how many ABC names pop-up, as opposed to other random alphabet letters.”¹³ Persons
9 whose names do not appear first in the alphabet are not a protected class, so Schaefer bears a heavy
10 pleading burden. Because § NRS 293.263’s alphabetical-listing directive does not target a suspect
11 class, the classification is constitutional “if there is any reasonably conceivable state of facts that
12 could provide a rational basis for the classification.”¹⁴ Schaefer cannot has not met—and cannot
13 meet—his FRCP 12(b)(6) pleading burden simply by alleging that there may be some statistical
14 significance to having a name at the front of the alphabet. Because Schaefer has not pled facts to
15 show that NRS § 293.263 is not rationally related to some legitimate government end, he has not
16 pled a plausible equal-protection claim, and his complaint must be dismissed with leave to amend.

17 **D. All other pending motions are denied as moot.**

18 All of Schaefer’s motions are mooted by this order. His request to correct the spelling of
19 defendant Barbara Cegavskey’s last name¹⁵ can be resolved in his amended complaint by spelling it
20 correctly there. His request for a decision on his objections to Magistrate Judge Ferenbach’s report
21
22

23
24 ¹¹ ECF 1-1 at 2.

25 ¹² *Id.* at 3.

26 ¹³ ECF 7 at 3.

27 ¹⁴ *FCC v. Beach Commc’n*, 508 U.S. 307, 313 (1993).

28 ¹⁵ ECF 10.

1 and recommendation¹⁶ is denied as moot in light of this order. His emergency motions for orders to
2 show cause¹⁷ seek relief based on a claim that has been dismissed, so I lack jurisdiction to grant the
3 requested relief. And because the relief he seeks is injunctive in nature (he wants me to direct the
4 Nevada Secretary of State to list candidates in a random, non-alphabetical order on the ballot), the
5 dismissal of Schaefer's complaint leaves him unable to demonstrate a likelihood of prevailing on a
6 claim, which is a prerequisite to injunctive relief.¹⁸

7 **Conclusion**

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Judge Ferenbach's report and recommendation
9 [ECF 2] is **ADOPTED**, plaintiff's objections [ECF 7] are **OVERRULED**, and plaintiff's complaint
10 [ECF 3] is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all other pending motions [ECF 10, 11, 12, 17, 18] are
12 **DENIED** as moot.

13 Plaintiff has until **April 15, 2016**, to file an amended complaint that states a plausible claim
14 for relief. If plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint by that deadline, this case will be dismissed
15 with prejudice without further warning.

16 Dated this 23rd day of March, 2016.

17 
18 _____
19 Jennifer A. Dorsey
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24

25 _____
26 ¹⁶ ECF 11.

27 ¹⁷ ECF 12, 17, 18.

28 ¹⁸ *Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky*, 586 F.3d 1109, 1127 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)).