

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH
CENTRAL DIVISION**

LEONARD JAMES LUCERO,
Plaintiff,

v.

MUNICIPAL CORP.,
Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER
TO AMEND DEFICIENT COMPLAINT &
DENYING MOTIONS**

Case No. 2:09-CV-101 CW

District Judge Clark Waddoups

Plaintiff, Leonard James Lucero, an inmate at Utah State Prison, filed this *pro se* civil rights suit. See 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 (2010). Plaintiff was allowed to proceed *in forma pauperis*. See 28 *id.* 1915. Reviewing the complaint under § 1915(e), the Court has determined that Plaintiff's complaint is deficient as described below.

Deficiencies in Complaint

Complaint:

- (a) states names in caption that do not match names in text.
- (b) is rambling, confusing, incoherent, and not concise.
- (c) in naming "Municipal Corp." as the defendant, does not comply with the municipal liability doctrine, as described below.
- (d) has claims appearing to be based on conditions of current confinement; however, the complaint was apparently not submitted using the legal help Plaintiff is entitled to by his institution under the Constitution. See *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 356 (1996) (requiring prisoners be given

"'adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in the law' . . . to ensure that inmates . . . have a reasonably adequate opportunity to file nonfrivolous legal claims challenging their convictions or conditions of confinement") (quoting *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817, 828 (1977) (emphasis added)).

Instructions to Plaintiff

Under Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure a complaint is required to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, . . . (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and (3) a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The requirements of Rule 8(a) are intended to guarantee "that defendants enjoy fair notice of what the claims against them are and the grounds upon which they rest." *TV Commc'ns Network, Inc. v. ESPN, Inc.*, 767 F. Supp. 1062, 1069 (D. Colo. 1991), *aff'd*, 964 F.2d 1022 (10th Cir. 1992).

Pro se litigants are not excused from compliance with the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8. "This is so because a pro se plaintiff requires no special legal training to recount the facts surrounding his alleged injury, and he must provide such facts if the court is to determine whether he makes out a claim on which relief can be granted." *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1009 (10th Cir. 1991). Moreover, "it is not the proper

function of the Court to assume the role of advocate for a pro se litigant." *Id.* at 1110. Thus, the Court cannot "supply additional facts, [or] construct a legal theory for plaintiff that assumes facts that have not been pleaded." *Dunn v. White*, 880 F.2d 1188, 1197 (10th Cir. 1989).

Plaintiff should consider the following points before refiling his complaint. First, the revised complaint must stand entirely on its own and shall not refer to, or incorporate by reference, any portion of the original complaint. See *Murray v. Archambo*, 132 F.3d 609, 612 (10th Cir. 1998) (stating amended complaint supercedes original). Second, the complaint must clearly state what each individual defendant did to violate Plaintiff's civil rights. See *Bennett v. Passic*, 545 F.2d 1260, 1262-63 (10th Cir. 1976) (stating personal participation of each named defendant is essential allegation in civil rights action). Third, Plaintiff cannot name an individual as a defendant based solely on his or her supervisory position. See *Mitchell v. Maynard*, 80 F.3d 1433, 1441, (10th Cir. 1996) (stating supervisory status alone is insufficient to support liability under § 1983). Fourth, if Plaintiff's claims relate to the conditions of Plaintiff's current confinement, Plaintiff should seeks help from his institution in preparing initial pleadings. And, fifth, Plaintiff is warned that litigants who have had three

in forma pauperis cases dismissed as frivolous or meritless will be restricted from filing future lawsuits without prepaying fees.

Finally, to establish the liability of municipal entities, under Section 1983, "a plaintiff must show (1) the existence of a municipal custom or policy and (2) a direct causal link between the custom or policy and the violation alleged." *Jenkins v. Wood*, 81 F.3d 988, 993-94 (10th Cir. 1996) (citing *City of Canton v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378, 385 (1989)). Municipal entities cannot be held liable under § 1983 based on the doctrine of *respondeat superior*. See *Cannon v. City and County of Denver*, 998 F.2d 867, 877 (10th Cir. 1993); see also *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978).

Plaintiff has not so far established a direct causal link between his alleged injuries and any custom or policy of a municipality. Thus, the Court concludes that Plaintiff's Complaint, as it stands, appears to fail to state claims against "Municipal Corp."

Motions for Appointed Counsel

Plaintiff has no constitutional right to counsel. See *Carper v. Deland*, 54 F.3d 613, 616 (10th Cir. 1995); *Bee v. Utah State Prison*, 823 F.2d 397, 399 (10th Cir. 1987). However, the Court may in its discretion appoint counsel for indigent inmates. See 28 U.S.C.S. § 1915(e)(1) (2010); *Carper*, 54 F.3d at 617;

Williams v. Meese, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991). "The burden is upon the applicant to convince the court that there is sufficient merit to his claim to warrant the appointment of counsel." *McCarthy v. Weinberg*, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985).

When deciding whether to appoint counsel, the district court should consider a variety of factors, "including 'the merits of the litigant's claims, the nature of the factual issues raised in the claims, the litigant's ability to present his claims, and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims.'" *Rucks v. Boergermann*, 57 F.3d 978, 979 (10th Cir. 1995) (quoting *Williams*, 926 F.2d at 996); accord *McCarthy*, 753 F.2d at 838-39.

Considering the above factors, the Court concludes here that, at this time, Plaintiff's claims may not be colorable, the issues in this case are not complex, and Plaintiff is not at this time too incapacitated or unable to adequately function in pursuing this matter. Thus, the Court denies for now Plaintiff's motions for appointed counsel.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

(1) Plaintiff shall have **THIRTY DAYS** from the date of this order to cure the deficiencies noted above.

(2) The Clerk's Office shall mail Plaintiff a copy of the Pro Se Litigant Guide.

(3) If Plaintiff fails to timely cure the above deficiencies according to the instructions here this action will be dismissed without further notice.

(4) Plaintiff's motions for appointed counsel are DENIED, (see Docket Entry #s 4 & 13); however, if, after the case develops further, it appears that counsel may be needed or of specific help, the Court will ask an attorney to appear pro bono on Plaintiff's behalf.

(5) Plaintiff's motions for service of process are DENIED as premature, pending his response to this Order. (See Docket Entry #s 5 & 23.)

(6) Plaintiff's motion for waiver of pacer and copy fees is DENIED because he has not stated what copies he needs nor his reasons for needing them. (See Docket Entry # 10.)

DATED this 21st day of February, 2010.

BY THE COURT:



CLARK WADDOUPS
United States District Judge