

Name  
Inmate #  
Address

FILED	RECEIVED
ENTERED	SERVED ON
COUNSEL/PARTIES OF RECORD	
AUG - 3 2020	
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT	
DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
RF	AB DEPUTY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

**"NO COPY!"**

Your name, Mitchell Keith Goodrum Case # 3:20-cv-00173-MMD(wgc)

Plaintiff,

v.

Name(s) of Defendants,  
STATE OF Nevada et al  
Defendants.

TITLE OF DOCUMENT

First Amended Complaint  
Pursuant to 42 USC § 1983

## EXHIBIT A

Page 4 of 4  
(Nature of Suit: 550 & 555)  
Revised: 3-13-18

1 Mitchell Keith Goodrum  
2 PO Box 1989  
3 Ely Nevada 89301  
4 89301-1989  
5 Inmate No. 1213846

6  
7 United States District Court  
8 District of Nevada  
9

10 Mitchell K. Goodrum  
11 Plaintiff.  
12 vs. State of Nevada.  
13 Govenor  
14 Steve Sisolack  
15 Director of Prisions  
16 Mr. McDaniels  
17 Warden  
18 Mr. Isirido Baca  
19 John Does 1-3  
20 inclusive  
21 Defendants,  
22

Case No. 3:20-cv-00173-MMD-WGC

First Amended  
Complaint Pursuant to  
42 USC § 1983  
"Deliberate Indifference"  
"Deprivation" under the  
Eighth Amendment  
"Cruel and Unusual Punishment"  
under Fourteenth Amendment  
"TORT" of Negligence Given  
Failure to Protect Claim.  
Demand for Jury  
Trial

23  
24 Introduction

25 1) This is a amended civil rights action filed by Mitchell  
26 K. Goodrum, a state prisioner, for damages under  
27 42 USC § 1983, alleging attempted rape in violation of  
28 (1)

1       Eighth and Fourteen amendments to the United States  
2       Constitution. Violation committed by persons under  
3       color of state law. (See) West v. Atkins, 487 US 42, 48  
4       (1988) the violation of a right secured by the Con-  
5       stitution or Laws of the United States, and that the  
6       alleged violation was committed by a person acting  
7       under color of State Law. Furthermore, secured un-  
8       der screening requierments of § 1915A, pursuant to  
9       Prision Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA") Under federal  
10      Rule of Civil Procedure (12)(b)(6) in review of ad-  
11      equacy of the complaint or an amended Complaint.  
12      The court should take this complaint as true in all  
13      light most favorable to the plaintiff "Mr. Goodrum".  
14      (See) Warshaw v. Xoma Corp., 74 F 3d 955, 957 (9th  
15      Cir 1996). Additionally, allow for this "pro se" com-  
16      plaint to be held to a less stringent Standard than  
17      formal pleading written by an attorney. (See) Hughes  
18      v. Rowe, 449 US 5, 9 (1980). Being that Rule 12  
19      (b)(6) does not require detailed factual allega-  
20      tions this plaintiff will show/provide more then  
21      labels and conclusions (See) Bell Atl v. Twombly  
22      550 US 544, 555 (2007) Plaintiff is presenting  
23      well-pleaded factual allegations, therefore the  
24      court should assume their veracity and then  
25      determine that they plausibly give rise to an  
26      entitlement to relief. Furthermore, find def-  
27      endants not immune from suit or claim of in-  
28      (See) Ayala Jerrano v. Lebron Gonzales 909 F.2d 8, 14 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir) (1990)

fringement of legal interest (see) *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327-28 (1989) where the opposite was the reality. In this complaint, Plaintiff sues multiple defendants for events that took place while plaintiff was incarcerated at Northern Nevada Correctional Center ("NNCC"), and followed-up with treatment both at "NNCC" and Ely State Prison over the next fourteen months. Plaintiff also alleges claims of violation of Federal Constitutional Rights under 42 USC § 1331(1) and 1343.

Plaintiff also alleges the tort of negligence.

Plaintiff reincorporates by reference paragraphs in this complaint in full length herein. A Biven claim of tort damages.

## Jurisdiction

2) The court has jurisdiction over the plaintiffs Federal Constitutional Rights under 42 USC § 1331 (1) and 1343. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's state law tort claim under 28 USC § 1337. Plaintiff sues Defendants Governor Mr. Steve Sisolack, Director Mr McDaniels, Warden Mr. Isirido Baca, and John Doe's 1-3 inclusive. Plaintiff alleges claims and seeks declaratory, injunctive, and monetary damages, against all defendants named in this complaint, for all listed violations of plaintiffs Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments, protected by the US Constitution of the United States of America.

## Parties

1  
2       3) The plaintiff Mitchell K. Goodrum, was incarce-  
3       rated at (NNCC) during the events described in  
4       this Complaint, with follow-up medical treat-  
5       ment at Ely State Prision and Ely Medical Center  
6       Ely Nevada. Alleges the following: adverse action against plaintiff,  
7       and said action did not advance a legitimate correctional goal.

8  
9       4) Defendant, Govenor Mr Steve Sisolack is the  
10      current govenor at the time of this filing. He  
11      had direct knowlage of the complaint by plaintiff  
12      when the govenor made a visit to Ely State Pri-  
13      Sion, building 2B in front of Cell 14 plaintiffs  
14      cell. Followed up with letters from plaintiff and  
15      plaintiff's family from Dec, 2019 to March, 2020.  
16      He is being sued in his official capacity and his  
17      individual capacity. His address is known to plaintiff  
18      as supervision powers over all Prision employees.

19  
20      He has an address of 101 N. Carson Street Carson City NV 89701

21  
22      5) Defendant, Mr. McDaniel the director of prisions  
23      for the State of Nevada also has first hand Knowlege  
24      of the Complaint, as he also was present with the  
25      govenor on a visit to "NNCC" and Ely Prision.  
26      He is being sued in his official capacity and his  
27      individual capacity. His address is know as  
28      5500 Snyder Ave. Carson City, Nevada 89701 He is in  
charge of supervision, operations and discipline.

29  
30      6) Warden Isirido Baca, defendant listed  
31      in this Complaint is being sued in his indivi-

1 dual and official capacity. His address is known to  
2 plaintiff as PO Box 7000 Carson City Nevada He  
3 is and/or was the Warden at the time of the  
4 incident of March 2019. He was directly involved at the time.  
5 7) John Doe's 1-3 all defendant's listed in this  
6 Complaint are being sued in both their individ-  
7 ual and official capacity's The address is known  
8 as PO Box 7000 Carson City Nevada. They are  
9 Correctional officers at "NNCC". whos names  
10 are unknown to plaintiff. (one c/o id is #1005)  
11 One Correctional officer is known as a Senior off-  
12 icer, two are known as officers. They showed  
13 "Deliberate Indifference" to plaintiff need for protection.

14 Claim 1

15 Facts of allegations.

16 8) In the interim of March 23 thru April 3, 2019  
17 plaintiff was incarcerated at "NNCC" for the purpose  
18 of Nevada Department of Corrections intake process.  
19 During which time plaintiff was housed in building 7.  
20 9) Defendant known as John Doe (3) employee No.  
21 #1005 on or about March 23 to March 27, 2019  
22 intentionally set into motion an act of rape  
23 upon plaintiff by contacting Six male (African  
24 American) males, inmates also housed in build-  
25 ing 7 with plaintiff.

26 10) On or about March 24 + March 25, 2019 the  
27 Five of Six inmates were witnessed by plaint-  
28 iff

1 Sitting in front of plaintiff's cell door at a table  
2 discussing how to go about the act of rape on  
3 the plaintiff. By doing so plaintiff alleges #  
4 # 1005 John Doe#1005 was in violation to plaintiff's  
5 civil rights under the United States Constitution  
6 of "equal protection" covered under the Eighth  
7 Amendment Right # 1005 John Doe#1005 showed Deliberate  
8 Indifference to protection under the Eighth Amendment.  
9 Cause physical harm as plaintiff suffered  
10 heart related stress pain, extreme depression,  
11 nightmares and mental issues, all of which plaintiff  
12 has been ongoing treatment by a heart  
13 specialist at Ely Medical Center in Ely NV and  
14 the medical provider at Ely Prision and thru  
15 tel-a-med with the psychiatrist and medications  
16 for nightmares, depression, heart stress, anxiety.  
17 Plaintiff also claims John Doe#1005 violated plaintiff's  
18 Fourteenth Amendment "Cruel and Unusual Punish-  
19 ment", "Deprivation under the Eight Amendment  
20 by planning a rape of plaintiff by inmates. Add-  
21 ionally, John Doe#1005 had made plans for  
22 the inmates to force plaintiff to preform oral  
23 copulation on John Doe#1005 or inmates would  
24 remove plaintiff's testicals if plaintiff failed to  
25 comply. All of which sent plaintiff to the hospital  
26 at "NNCC" and infirmary to recover prior to be-  
27 ing transported to Ely State Prision. Plaintiff did not  
28 recover prior to being sent to Ely State Prision.

1 1.) Defendant, Mr Isirido Baca the Warden at the time  
2 at "NNCC" became aware of the planned rape and  
3 confronted John Doe<sup>#</sup>1005 on or about March 23<sup>rd</sup>  
4 2019 along with a female of Authority.

5 2.) John Doe<sup>#</sup>1005 admitted to the act of planning the  
6 rape upon plaintiff. Stating he<sup>#</sup>1005) had brought  
7 Condoms so thier would be no evidence of the  
8 rape upon plaintiff.<sup>3)</sup> Mr. Baca was an active  
9 participant in the cover-up of the plan to  
10 assault plaintiff. Mr. Baca therefore was in viol-  
11 ation of plaintiffs Eighth Amendment Right to equal  
12 protection from Cruel and Unusual punishment.  
13 Violated plaintiffs right to equal protection off-  
14 orded plaintiff under the Fourteenth Amend-  
15 ment of the US Constitution, by not terminat-  
16 ing John Doe<sup>#</sup>1005) he was therefore able to  
17 continue the planned rape with the inmates.  
18 Thus was the cause of plaintiff's illness. Mr.

19 14) Baca knew or should have known John Doe<sup>#</sup>1005  
20 was a threat to the health and Safety of plaint-  
21 iff. Mr. Baca showed a colorable denial of  
22 plaintiffs Constitutional Rights to equal protec-  
23 tion, cruel and unusual punishment, actual  
24 prejudice towards plaintiff. Plaintiff has and  
25 does suffer irreparable injury by way of  
26 nightmares, deepened depression, highten anxiety  
27 suisidal thoughts and actions, heart and chest

related pain. All of which plaintiff is currently receiving medication for and mental health and physical health related treatment, as will be provided upon trial and/or discovery process.

15) John Doe's 1-3 inclusive refused plaintiffs calls for help. Failure of defendant's 1-3 inclusive to take action to protect plaintiff or any action to curb the attempted planning of rape of plaintiff constitutes "Deliberate Indifference" to plaintiff safety and health and contributed to the proximately caused the above described violation of plaintiff's Eighth Amendment Right

16) The failure of all defendants to take proper disciplinary or other actions against defendants John Doe<sup>#</sup>(3)1005 , John Doe(1-2) inclusive violates inmate Goodrum Fourteenth Amendment right to equal protection of the law. Defendants showed "Deliberate Indifference", "Deprivation" and "cruel and unusual punishment" by the act of planning the rape, and then by Supiriors not acting to prevent John Doe<sup>#</sup>(3)1005 from continuing the planning, causing plaintiff to become ill. All in violation of plaintiff's Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment Right and plaintiff claims the Tort of negelgence by Ely administration for failure to act timely and appropertly. These actions against plaintiff were without provocation was done Sadistically and maliciously constituting "Cruel and unusual punishment".

## Claim 2

### Facts of allegations

17) Plaintiff alleges the following: Mr. Baca refused  
to take responsibility for his non-action as stated  
in the grievance process. Mr. Baca denied the  
incident ever took place. Mr. Baca failed to  
provide any remedies or resolutions to plaintiff's  
grievances and willfully rejected plaintiff's grie-  
vances. Deceived the Inspector General in the  
investigation by claiming it did not happen as  
alleged, (NOT That it did not happen) just nota  
alleged. The grievance process was unconstitutional  
because prison officials denied or rejected plaintiff's  
complaints in the form of grievances, stating time-  
lessness or would say that something was missing  
never addressing the very serious issue of a 90%  
raping inmates and therefore protecting correctional  
officers and officials, even though the 1005  
openly admitted to the crime.

18) The Governor Mr Steve Sisolak was face-to-face  
with plaintiff on or about the second week in  
December 2019. He heard the plea for help from  
door number 14 in building ZB at Ely State  
Prision, his deputy director received a hand  
written statement from plaintiff at that meeting  
yet has failed to address the issue or take  
appropriate action. Causing 'Deliberate Indifference',

1           19) Although plaintiff challenging of the non-response  
2           by prison officials, and relizes prisoners have no  
3           right to stand allown due process rights related to  
4           the administrative grievence process. (See) Mann v.  
5           Adams, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir 1988) Prisoners  
6           do have a constitutional right of protection under the  
7           US Constitutional Rights. Plaintiff did suffer actual  
8           injury by way of heart related stress causing hospital-  
9           azation, Nitro pills "ongoing", increased depression to  
10          sever depression, nightmares needed night terror med-  
11          ications, sleep aids and anxiety medication. As well as  
12          need/Serious need for psychological counseling, a psychi-  
13          atrist, and heart specialist procedure and a medical  
14          doctors visits, all ongoing. Therefore, plaintiff alleges  
15          his constitutionally protected liberty interest has  
16          been violated including but not limited to his Eighth, Four-  
17          teenth Constitutional rights, that he was actually  
18          injured as a result of the action and the non-  
19          actions of Department of Corrections employees and  
20          by the State Goverment Mr. Steve Sisolack who  
21          has to the best of plaintiff knowlge done nothing  
22          to disipline staff, as he oversee's the operations,  
23          procedures, and disipline of employees under his  
24          was, and is Watch, Thus showing Deliberate Indifference.  
25          and violated plaintiffs due process "Additionally, violated  
26          plaintiff First Amendment right against Verbal Sexual  
27          harassment, and/or the Eighth Amendment to protect  
28          against Sexual harassment.

1      20) Under the Eighth Amendment, prisoners officials overseeing,  
2      have a duty to protect prisoners from violence at  
3      the hands of other prisoners Farmer v. Brennan, 511 US  
4      825, 833 (1994) Mr Baca was infact "Deliberately  
5      Indifferent" to a Serious threat to plaintiff's health  
6      and safety. Mr. Baca knew by way of Correctional  
7      Officer #1005 John Doe openly admitting to the  
8      planned Sexual assault "Rape" of plaintiff"  
9      along with help from inmates. Mr. Baca dis -  
10     regarded an excessive risk to plaintiff by allow -  
11     ing John Doe #1005 to continue to work at the  
12     prision in building 7. and John Doe #1005  
13     was able to continue planning to execute the  
14     rape assault on Mr. Goodrum, thus causing him  
15     to become so stressed it affected his health. Mr  
16     21) Baca was both aware of the facts from which the  
17     inference could be drawn that a Substantial risk  
18     of Serious harm existed. Therefore, Mr. Baca,  
19     22) John Doe's 1-2 and John Doe 3 #1005 all could  
20     draw the inference Substantial harm exists.

21     23) The Govenor and Director both failed to add-  
22     ress the issues timely. Therefore, officials  
23     may not escape liability because they claim they  
24     cannot, or did not, identify the specific source  
25     of the risk, that even a lay person could  
26     see the Serious threat which plaintiff was  
27     exposed to, and failed to address it properly.  
28     (See) Farmer v. Brennan 511 US, 825, 114 S CT 1970(1974)

1       24) This complaint (amended) supersedes the original  
2       (see) Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v Richard Feiner &  
3       Co, Inc., 896 F. 2d 1542, 1546 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 1989) Also (see)  
4       Lacey v. Maricopa County, 693 F.3d 896, 928 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2012)  
5       Therefore, plaintiff has satisfied all claims, defendant's,  
6       and factual allegations that plaintiff wishes  
7       to pursue in this lawsuit. Having a constitutional right to sue  
8       in court (see) Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343, 346 (1996) And having filed  
9       prision grievenre, now pursue civil rights litigation in the Court  
10      (See) Rhodes v. Robinson, 408 F.3d 559, 567 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2004)

### Exhaustion of Administration Remedies

11      13) The plaintiff has exhausted all administrative rem-  
12      edies pursuant to AR 740 in respect to all claims and  
13      all defendants, complied with all grievenre procedures,  
14      reported to the Inspector General and chain of com-  
15      mand via the Director and Governor offices.

### Relief Requested

16      19) Wherefore, plaintiff respectfully request that the  
20      Court grant the following:

21      A) Issue a declaratory judgement stating that:

22      1.) The attempted rape of the plaintiff by def-  
23      endant John Doe (3) #1005 violated plaintiff's  
24      Eighth Amendment Right and constituted  
25      attempted rape and Fourteenth Amendment.

26      2.) Defendant Isirido Baca and Siniors  
27      c/o's (1-2) failed to take action against  
28      John Doe Known as #1005 (3) constitutes

1 a violation of plaintiffs Eighth Amendment Right  
2 and constitutes attempted rape under state law.

3) Defendant's Warden Baca and Director of Prisions

4 Mr. McDaniels failed to take action of discipline or  
5 release of John Doe # 1005(3) who continued to viol-  
6 ate plaintiffs Eighth Amendment and Fourteenth Amend-  
7 ment Rights by allowing John Doe to continue planning the rape.

8 4) Issue an injunction ordering defendant Mr. Daniels  
9 to immediately order the demand for resignation from  
10 John Doe (3) also known as employee # 1005

11 5) Award Compensatory damages in the following amounts:

12 A) \$ 250,000<sup>00</sup> Jointly and Severally against defendants  
13 Govenor Steve Sisolack, Warden Baca, Director Mr.  
14 McDaniels for the physical injury's to plaintiff's  
15 heart chest pain issues, as well as emotional drama.

16 B) \$ 150,000<sup>00</sup> Jointly and Severally against defend-  
17 ants John Doe (1-3) inclusive for the physical  
18 and emotional damages "injuries", resulting from  
19 the denial of equal protection of the plaintiff,  
20 which also applies to (A) defendant's listed above

21 c) Award punitive damages in the following  
22 amounts for the fort of negligence:

23 \$ 50,000<sup>00</sup> each against defendants Mr. Baca,  
24 Mr. McDaniels, Mr. Sisolack, and defendants  
25 John Doe's (1-3) inclusive Violated Rights

26 Grant such other relief as the court may

27 See plaintiff is entitled, Plaintiff makes this amended Com-  
28 plaint (See) Valandingham v. Bojorquez. 866 F2d 1135, 1138 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 1989)

1 Respectfully submitted this 25 day of July 2020  
2  
3

4 by: Mitchell K Goodrum  
5  
6

Mitchell Keith Goodrum

plaintiff

7

8 Legal case law: Injunctive relief. The injunctive relief is  
9 in the public interest to avoid further denial of action,

10 (See) ~~Am~~ Trucking Ass'n's Inc v. City of Los Angeles, 559 F.3d

11 1046, 1052 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2009) Furthermore, it allows for  
12 the intrusive means necessary to correct harm 18 USC

13 § 3626(a)(2) Also (See) Roland 854 F.2d at 770, officials warned  
14 about sexual predators, yet failed for reclassifying them from general population.

15 Previous Lawsuits: 3:20-cv-00173-MMD-WGC org. complaint.

16 3:20-cv-00195 -RFB-WGC org. Complaint.

17

18 Plaintiff is indigent and therefore request an Civil Rights  
19 attorney be assigned to this claim at no up front cost  
20 to plaintiff.

21

22 Mitchell K Goodrum

23 PO BOX 1989

24 Ely Nevada 89301-1989

25 Inmate No 1213846

26

27

28

**AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030**

I, Mitchell Keith Goodrum, NDOC# 1213846,

CERTIFY THAT I AM THE UNDERSIGNED INDIVIDUAL AND THAT THE  
ATTACHED DOCUMENT ENTITLED First Amended Complaint

42 USC § 1983 Case # 3:20-cv-00173-MHD-WGC

DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER OF ANY  
PERSONS, UNDER THE PAINS AND PENALTIES OF PERJURY.

DATED THIS 25 DAY OF July, 2020.

SIGNATURE: Mitchell Goodrum

INMATE PRINTED NAME: Mitchell Goodrum

INMATE NDOC # 1213846

INMATE ADDRESS: ELY STATE PRISON  
P. O. BOX 1989  
ELY, NV 89301

## **DECLARATION PURSUANT TO: N.R.S. 208.165**

I, Mitchell Keith Goodrum, OF INMATE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: 320 CV-00173-MHD-WGC, AM A LAWFULLY COMMITTED PRISONER OF THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, PRESENTLY IN THE LAWFUL CARE AND CUSTODY OF ELY STATE PRISON, LOCATED AT: 12000 NORTH BOTHWICK ROAD, (MAILING) P.O. BOX 1989, IN CITY OF: ELY, COUNTY: WHITE PINE, STATE: NEVADA, 89301. DOES AFFIRM THAT THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT ENTITLED: First Amended Complaint 42 USC § 1983, IS TRUE & CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE & BELIEF, AND ANY FALSE STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACT MADE THERE IN SHALL BE SUBJECTED TO THE PAINS AND PENALTIES OF PERJURY PURSUANT TO: N.R.S. 208.165, THIS, 25, DAY OF: July, 2020

INMATE SIGNATURE: Mitchell Keith Goodrum

INMATE NAME (PRINTED): Mitchell Keith Goodrum

ADDRESS: ELY STATE PRISON

P.O. BOX 1989, ELY, NEVADA 89301