

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

FRANCISCO SANCHES,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Civil Action No. 07-1344(RMB)
	:	
v.	:	O P I N I O N
	:	
NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF	:	
CORRECTIONS, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
_____	:	

APPEARANCES :

FRANCISCO SANCHES, Plaintiff pro se
 #522300/634266B
 South Woods State Prison
 215 Burlington Road South
 Bridgeton, New Jersey 08302

BUMB, District Judge

Plaintiff, Francisco Sanches ("Sanches"), is a state prisoner currently confined at the South Woods State Prison in Bridgeton, New Jersey, at the time he submitted this Complaint for filing. He seeks to bring this action in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Based on his affidavit of indigence, and his six-month prison account statement, the Court grants plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and directs the Clerk of the Court to file the Complaint without pre-payment of the filing fee.

Having reviewed the Complaint to identify cognizable claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A, the Court concludes that the Complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

I. BACKGROUND

The following factual allegations are taken from the Complaint and are accepted as true for purposes of this review. In his Complaint, Sanches asserts a denial of medical care claim against named defendants, the New Jersey Department of Corrections ("NJDOC") and the medical staff of the Correctional Medical Service ("CMS") at South Woods State Prison ("SWSP").

Sanches alleges that, in February 2006, he was screened by the medical department in the Central Reception Facility, and learned that he had severe hemorrhoids that required surgery. He was then transferred to SWSP and has been waiting for the prescribed surgery. Sanches states that he has filed medical request slips and remedy forms to the SWSP administration, but still has not had his hemorrhoid surgery. He also complains that the times that he has received medical care at SWSP, he has been "disrespected by [the] medical staff workers and doctors." (Complaint, ¶ 6).

Sanches seeks \$1 million in damages for loss of vision in his right eye and damage to his rectum area from severe bleeding. (Compl., ¶ 7).

II. STANDARDS FOR A SUA SPONTE DISMISSAL

The Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA"), Pub. L. No. 104-134, §§ 801-810, 110 Stat. 1321-66 to 1321-77 (April 26, 1996), requires a district court to review a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner is proceeding in forma pauperis or seeks redress against a governmental employee or entity. The Court is required to identify cognizable claims and to sua sponte dismiss any claim that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A.¹

In determining the sufficiency of a pro se complaint, the Court must be mindful to construe it liberally in favor of the plaintiff. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972); United States v. Day, 969 F.2d 39, 42 (3d Cir. 1992). The Court must assume the truth of the allegations in the complaint and all reasonable inferences that can be drawn therefrom, and view them in the light most favorable to the plaintiffs. Gibson v.

¹ Plaintiff should also be aware that the PLRA requires Courts to determine whether a prisoner has, on three or more prior occasions while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in federal court that was dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. If so, the prisoner is precluded from bringing an action in forma pauperis unless he or she is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). It appears that plaintiff has not incurred any strikes under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

Superintendent of N.J. Dep't of Law & Pub. Safety-Division, 411 F.3d 427, 431 (3d Cir. 2005). The Court need not, however, credit a pro se plaintiff's "bald assertions" or "legal conclusions." Id.

A complaint is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989) (interpreting the predecessor of § 1915(e)(2), the former § 1915(d)). The standard for evaluating whether a complaint is "frivolous" is an objective one. Deutsch v. United States, 67 F.3d 1080, 1086-87 (3d Cir. 1995).

A pro se complaint may be dismissed for failure to state a claim only if it appears "'beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief.'" Haines, 404 U.S. at 521 (quoting Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957)); Milhouse v. Carlson, 652 F.2d 371, 373 (3d Cir. 1981). However, where a complaint can be remedied by an amendment, a district court may not dismiss the complaint with prejudice, but must permit the amendment. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 34 (1992); Alston v. Parker, 363 F.3d 229 (3d Cir. 2004)(complaint that satisfied notice pleading requirement that it contain short, plain statement of the claim but lacked sufficient detail to function as a guide to discovery was not required to be dismissed for failure to state a claim; district court should permit a curative amendment before

dismissing a complaint, unless an amendment would be futile or inequitable); Grayson v. Mayview State Hospital, 293 F.3d 103, 108 (3d Cir. 2002) (dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)); Shane v. Fauver, 213 F.3d 113, 116-17 (3d Cir. 2000) (dismissal pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c)(1)); Urrutia v. Harrisburg County Police Dept., 91 F.3d 451, 453 (3d Cir. 1996). A complaint that sets forth facts which affirmatively demonstrate that the plaintiff has no right to recover is properly dismissed without leave to amend. Grayson, 293 F.3d at 106.

III. SECTION 1983 LIABILITY

Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of his constitutional rights. Section 1983 provides in relevant part:

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory ... subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress

Thus, to state a claim for relief under § 1983, plaintiff must allege, first, the violation of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States and, second, that the alleged deprivation was committed or caused by a person acting under color of state law. West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48

(1988); Piecknick v. Pennsylvania, 36 F.3d 1250, 1255-56 (3d Cir. 1994).

Moreover, "[a] defendant in a civil rights action must have personal involvement in the alleged wrongs, liability cannot be predicated solely on the operation of respondeat superior. Personal involvement can be shown through allegations of personal direction or of actual knowledge and acquiescence." Rode v. Dellarciprete, 845 F.2d 1195, 1207 (3d Cir. 1988) (citations omitted). Accord Robinson v. City of Pittsburgh, 120 F.3d 1286, 1293-96 (3d Cir. 1997); Baker v. Monroe Twp., 50 F.3d 1186, 1190-91 (3d Cir. 1995).

IV. ANALYSIS

A. Eleventh Amendment Immunity

The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that, "The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State."

As a general proposition, a suit by private parties seeking to impose a liability which must be paid from public funds in a state treasury is barred from federal court by the Eleventh Amendment, unless Eleventh Amendment immunity is waived by the state itself or by federal statute. See, e.g., Edelman v. Jordan, 415 U.S. 651, 663 (1974). The Eleventh Amendment

protects states and their agencies and departments from suit in federal court regardless of the type of relief sought. Pennhurst State School and Hospital v. Halderman, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984); see also Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 64, 70-71 and n.10 (1989)(neither states, nor governmental entities that are considered arms of the state for Eleventh Amendment purposes, nor state officers sued in their official capacities for money damages are persons within the meaning of § 1983). Thus, Section 1983 does not override a state's Eleventh Amendment immunity. Quern v. Jordan, 440 U.S. 332 (1979).

Therefore, the Complaint will be dismissed in its entirety against the state agency defendant, the New Jersey Department of Corrections.

B. Denial of Medical Care Claim

In his Complaint, Sanches alleges that defendant CMS medical staff has denied medical care for the treatment of plaintiff's severe hemorrhoids. He claims that surgery for his condition was prescribed at the Central Reception Facility before he was transferred to SWSP. Sanches is still awaiting surgery and suffers from bleeding from his hemorrhoids.

The Eighth Amendment proscription against cruel and unusual punishment requires that prison officials provide inmates with adequate medical care. Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 103-04 (1976); Rouse v. Plantier, 182 F.3d 192 (3d Cir. 1999). In order

to set forth a cognizable claim for a violation of his right to adequate medical care, an inmate must allege: (1) a serious medical need; and (2) behavior on the part of prison officials that constitutes deliberate indifference to that need. Estelle, 429 U.S. at 106; Natale v. Camden County Correctional Facility, 318 F.3d 575, 582 (3d Cir. 2003).

To satisfy the first prong of the Estelle inquiry, the inmate must demonstrate that his medical needs are serious. "Because society does not expect that prisoners will have unqualified access to health care, deliberate indifference to medical needs amounts to an Eighth Amendment violation only if those needs are 'serious.'" Hudson v. McMillian, 503 U.S. 1, 9 (1992). The Third Circuit has defined a serious medical need as: (1) "one that has been diagnosed by a physician as requiring treatment;" (2) "one that is so obvious that a lay person would recognize the necessity for a doctor's attention;" or (3) one for which "the denial of treatment would result in the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain" or "a life-long handicap or permanent loss." Atkinson v. Taylor, 316 F.3d 257, 272-73 (3d Cir. 2003)(internal quotations and citations omitted); see also Monmouth County Correctional Institutional Inmates v. Lanzaro, 834 F.2d 326, 347 (3d Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 486 U.S. 1006 (1988).

The second element of the Estelle test requires an inmate to show that prison officials acted with deliberate indifference to his serious medical need. See Natale, 318 F.3d at 582 (finding deliberate indifference requires proof that the official knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to inmate health or safety). "Deliberate indifference" is more than mere malpractice or negligence; it is a state of mind equivalent to reckless disregard of a known risk of harm. Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837-38 (1994). Furthermore, a prisoner's subjective dissatisfaction with his medical care does not in itself indicate deliberate indifference. Andrews v. Camden County, 95 F. Supp.2d 217, 228 (D.N.J. 2000); Peterson v. Davis, 551 F. Supp. 137, 145 (D. Md. 1982), aff'd, 729 F.2d 1453 (4th Cir. 1984). Similarly, "mere disagreements over medical judgment do not state Eighth Amendment claims." White v. Napoleon, 897 F.2d 103, 110 (3d Cir. 1990). "Courts will disavow any attempt to second-guess the propriety or adequacy of a particular course of treatment ... [which] remains a question of sound professional judgment." Inmates of Allegheny County Jail v. Pierce, 612 F.2d 754, 762 (3d Cir. 1979) (internal quotation and citation omitted). Even if a doctor's judgment concerning the proper course of a prisoner's treatment ultimately is shown to be mistaken, at most what would be proved is medical malpractice and not an Eighth Amendment violation. Estelle, 429 U.S. at 105-06; White, 897 F.3d at 110.

The Third Circuit has found deliberate indifference where a prison official: (1) knows of a prisoner's need for medical treatment but intentionally refuses to provide it; (2) delays necessary medical treatment for non-medical reasons; or (3) prevents a prisoner from receiving needed or recommended treatment. See Rouse, 182 F.3d at 197. The court has also held that needless suffering resulting from the denial of simple medical care, which does not serve any penological purpose, violates the Eighth Amendment. Atkinson, 316 F.3d at 266. See also Monmouth County Correctional Institutional Inmates, 834 F.2d at 346 ("deliberate indifference is demonstrated '[w]hen ... prison authorities prevent an inmate from receiving recommended treatment for serious medical needs or deny access to a physician capable of evaluating the need for such treatment"); Durmer v. O'Carroll, 991 F.2d 64 (3d Cir. 1993); White v. Napoleon, 897 F.2d 103 (3d Cir. 1990).

Here, Sanches alleges that he has been denied recommended surgery for his hemorrhoids, and that he has suffered severe bleeding. He attaches a Request System & Remedy Form, dated July 2006, which shows that Sanches has requested treatment three times for his worsening condition. The form contains a staff response confirming that Sanches was seen by a specialist on June 15, 2006, who requested additional testing. It also sets forth that the testing was scheduled and the medical staff was

attempting to expedite the testing for plaintiff. In the interim, plaintiff was given a special seat and a prescription was issued for no prolonged sitting.

Based on these allegations, the Court finds that Sanches may be able to support a claim of serious medical need, if, in fact, he can show that surgery for his condition was prescribed by doctors. However, Sanches has not demonstrated the second prong necessary to establish a denial of medical care claim - he has not shown deliberate indifference by the defendant CMS medical staff.

Sanches admits that he has received medical attention upon submission of his medical request forms. In the remedy form he attaches to his Complaint, it is clear that CMS had referred plaintiff to a specialist for treatment, and that the specialist had requested more testing for plaintiff's condition. The CMS medical staff had been attempting to expedite this testing for Sanches as requested. Sanches does not allege that further requests for medical care have not been addressed by defendant CMS since its response to his July 2006 remedy form. Thus, based on these facts, as confirmed by plaintiff's attachment to his Complaint, Sanches cannot show that defendant has intentionally refused to provide medical care. Nor can Sanches demonstrate that defendant delayed medical care for non-medical reasons because additional testing was requested by the medical

specialist before any surgery. Finally, Sanches has not shown that defendant has actually prevented him from receiving recommended medical treatment. See Rouse, 182 F.3d at 197.

Therefore, the Court finds no deliberate indifference by defendant CMS to plaintiff's serious medical need on the facts alleged by plaintiff at this time that would rise to the level of an actionable violation of constitutional dimension under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Accordingly, the Complaint will be dismissed without prejudice to plaintiff filing a new action pleading facts sufficient to support a claim of deliberate indifference as set forth above.

V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the Court will dismiss the Complaint in its entirety, as against defendant the New Jersey Department of Corrections, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii) and 1915A(b)(2), based on Eleventh Amendment immunity. The Complaint also will be dismissed without prejudice as against the remaining defendant, CMS medical staff, for failure to state a claim at this time, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and 1915A(b)(1). An appropriate Order follows.

s/Renée Marie Bumb
RENÉE MARIE BUMB
United States District Judge

DATED: March 29, 2007