
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

KARL LOSEE,

Plaintiff,

v.

SGT. PREECE et al.,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM DECISION
& ORDER DISMISSING SOME
CLAIMS & REQUIRING
PLAINTIFF TO CURE DEFICIENT
SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Case No. 2:18-CV-195-TC

District Judge Tena Campbell

Plaintiff, inmate Karl Losee, filed this *pro se* civil rights suit, *see* 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 (2020).¹ Having now screened the Second Amended Complaint, (ECF No. 28), under its statutory review function,² the Court dismisses some claims and orders Plaintiff to file a third amended complaint to cure deficiencies before further pursuing other claims.

¹The federal statute creating a “civil action for deprivation of rights” reads, in pertinent 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, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer’s judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable.

42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 (2020).

²The screening statute reads:

- (a) Screening.—The court shall review . . . a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.
- (b) Grounds for dismissal.—On review, the court shall identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint—
- (1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or
 - (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C.S. § 1915A (2020).

I. DISMISSAL ON SCREENING

A. FAILURE-TO-STATE-A-CLAIM STANDARD

When deciding whether a complaint states a claim upon which relief may be granted, the Court takes all well-pleaded factual statements as true and regards them in a light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Ridge at Red Hawk L.L.C. v. Schneider*, 493 F.3d 1174, 1177 (10th Cir. 2007). Dismissal is fitting when, viewing those facts as true, the Court sees that the plaintiff has not posed a "plausible" right to relief. *See Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007); *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1247-48 (10th Cir. 2008). "The burden is on the plaintiff to frame a 'complaint with enough factual matter (taken as true) to suggest' that he or she is entitled to relief." *Robbins*, 519 F.3d at 1247 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). When a civil rights complaint contains "bare assertions," involving "nothing more than a 'formulaic recitation of the elements' of a constitutional . . . claim," the Court considers those assertions "conclusory and not entitled to" an assumption of truth. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1951 (2009) (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 554-55). In other words, "the mere metaphysical possibility that *some* plaintiff could prove *some* set of facts in support of the pleaded claims is insufficient; the complaint must give the court reason to believe that *this* plaintiff has a reasonable likelihood of mustering factual support for *these* claims." *Red Hawk*, 493 F.3d at 1177 (italics in original).

The Court construes *pro se* "pleadings liberally," applying a less stringent standard than is applicable to pleadings filed by lawyers. Th[e] court, however, will not supply additional factual allegations to round out a plaintiff's complaint or construct a legal theory on a plaintiff's behalf." *Whitney v. New Mexico*, 113 F.3d 1170, 1173-74 (10th Cir. 1997) (citations omitted). The Tenth Circuit holds that, if the pleadings can reasonably be read "to state a valid claim on which the

plaintiff could prevail, [they should be read] so despite the plaintiff's failure to cite proper legal authority, his confusion of various legal theories, his poor syntax and sentence construction, or his unfamiliarity with pleading requirements." *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991). Still, "the proper function of the district court [is not] to assume the role of advocate for the pro se litigant." *Id.*; see also *Peterson v. Shanks*, 149 F.3d 1140, 1143 (10th Cir. 1998) (citing *Dunn v. White*, 880 F.2d 1188, 1197 (10th Cir. 1989) (per curiam)). Dismissing the complaint "without affording the plaintiff notice or an opportunity to amend is proper only 'when it is patently obvious that the plaintiff could not prevail on the facts alleged, and allowing him an opportunity to amend his complaint would be futile.'" *Curley v. Perry*, 246 F.3d 1278, 1281-82 (10th Cir. 2001) (quoting *Hall*, 935 F.2d at 1110 (additional quotation marks omitted)).

B. CLAIM OF LACK OF MEANINGFUL GRIEVANCE REVIEW

Plaintiff alleges that **Defendant Haddon** did not provide him a grievance process. However, "there is no independent constitutional right to state administrative grievance procedures. Nor does the state's voluntary provision of administrative grievance process create a liberty interest in that process." *Boyd v. Werholtz*, 443 F. App'x 331, 332 (10th Cir. 2011) (unpublished). This claim is thus dismissed.

C. CLAIM OF RIGHT TO RECORDS

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Haddon denied him records he needs to pursue his claims here. There is no particular "right to records." Also, litigation mechanisms in prisoner cases give the Court the discretion to drive discovery as warranted. Thus, the Court will issue orders regarding the discovery it deems necessary at a later date. Discovery is premature at this time with no valid complaint on the docket (as of this Order).

D. JOHN DOE DEFENDANTS

Plaintiff asserts that, on September 30, 2014, Defendants John Doe and John Doe 2 placed Plaintiff near an inmate who had assaulted him in the past. However, no new injury took place at that time. This claim alleges constitutional violations resulting in the type of injuries prohibited by 42 U.S.C.S. § 1997e(e) (2020), which reads, "No Federal civil action may be brought by a prisoner . . . for mental or emotional injury suffered while in custody without a prior showing of a physical injury or the commission of a sexual act."

These John Doe defendants were not involved in events in which Plaintiff was caused physical injury and so are not liable for any mental or emotional injury Plaintiff implies he suffered on September 30, 2014. John Does defendants are thus dismissed.

II. CURING DEFICIENT REMAINING CLAIMS

A. REMAINING CLAIMS' DEFICIENCIES

Second Amended Complaint:

(a) does not affirmatively link Defendants to some civil-rights violations--e.g., referral to eye specialist. (See below.)

(b) appears to inappropriately allege civil-rights violations on respondeat-superior theory--e.g., Defendant Haddon.

(c) does not state basis for claimed violation regarding failure to provide personal assistant.

(d) does not adequately state claim of inadequate medical treatment. (See below.)

(e) shows confusion about how to state claim of failure to protect. (See below.)

(f) needs clarification regarding unnecessary-rigor cause of action under Utah Constitution. (See below.)

GUIDANCE FOR PLAINTIFF

Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires a complaint to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction . . . ; (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and (3) a demand for the relief sought." Rule 8's requirements mean 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).

Pro se litigants are not excused from complying with these minimal pleading demands. "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, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991). Moreover, it is improper for the Court "to assume the role of advocate for a pro se litigant." *Id.* 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 these general points before filing an amended complaint:

(1) The revised complaint must stand entirely on its own and shall not refer to, or incorporate by reference, any portion of past complaints. *See Murray v. Archambo*, 132 F.3d 609, 612 (10th Cir. 1998) (stating amended complaint supersedes original). The amended complaint may also not be added to after it is filed without moving for amendment.³

³The rule on amending a pleading reads:

(a) Amendments Before Trial.

(1) Amending as a Matter of Course. A party may amend its pleading once as a matter of course within:

(2) The complaint must clearly state what each defendant--typically, a named government employee--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). "To state a claim, a complaint must 'make clear exactly *who* is alleged to have done *what* to *whom*.'" *Stone v. Albert*, 338 F. App'x 757, (10th Cir. 2009) (unpublished) (emphasis in original) (quoting *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008)). Plaintiff should also include, as much as possible, specific dates or at least estimates of when alleged constitutional violations occurred.

(3) Each cause of action, together with the facts and citations that directly support it, should be stated separately. Plaintiff should be as brief as possible while still using enough words to fully explain the "who," "what," "where," "when," and "why" of each claim. *Robbins*, 519 F.3d at 1248 ("The [*Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*] Court was particularly critical of complaints that 'mentioned no specific, time, place, or person involved in the alleged [claim].' [550 U.S. 544, 565] n.10 (2007). Given such a complaint, 'a defendant seeking to respond to plaintiff's conclusory allegations . . . would have little idea where to begin.' *Id.*").

(A) 21 days after serving it, or
 (B) if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after service of a responsive pleading or 21 days after service of a motion under Rule 12(b), (e), or (f), whichever is earlier.

(2) Other Amendments. In all other cases, a party may amend its pleadings only with the opposing party's written consent or the court's leave. The court should freely give leave when justice so requires.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15.

(4) Plaintiff may not name an individual as a defendant based solely on his or her supervisory position. *See Mitchell v. Maynard*, 80 F.2d 1433, 1441 (10th Cir. 1996) (stating supervisory status alone does not support § 1983 liability).

(5) Grievance denial alone with no connection to “violation of constitutional rights alleged by plaintiff, does not establish personal participation under § 1983.” *Gallagher v. Shelton*, No. 09-3113, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 25787, at *11 (10th Cir. Nov. 24, 2009).

(6) “No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under . . . Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.” 42 U.S.C.S. § 1997e(a) (2019). However, Plaintiff need not include grievance details in the complaint. Exhaustion of administrative remedies is an affirmative defense that must be raised by Defendants. *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 216 (2007).

• **Affirmative Link**

[A] plaintiff who brings a constitutional claim under § 1983 can't obtain relief without first satisfying the personal-participation requirement. That is, the plaintiff must demonstrate the defendant "personally participated in the alleged constitutional violation" at issue. *Vasquez v. Davis*, 882 F.3d 1270, 1275 (10th Cir. 2018). Indeed, because § 1983 is a "vehicle[] for imposing personal liability on government officials, we have stressed the need for careful attention to particulars, especially in lawsuits involving multiple defendants." *Pahls v. Thomas*, 718 F.3d 1210, 1225 (10th Cir. 2013); *see also Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008) (explaining that when plaintiff brings § 1983 claims against multiple defendants, "it is particularly important . . . that the complaint make clear exactly *who* is alleged to have done *what* to *whom*"); *Tonkovich v. Kan. Bd. of Regents*, 159 F.3d 504, 532-33 (10th Cir. 1998)) (holding that district court's analysis of plaintiff's § 1983 claims was "infirm" where district court "lump[ed]" together plaintiff's claims against multiple defendants--"despite the fact that each of the defendants had different powers and duties and took different actions with respect to [plaintiff]"--and "wholly failed to identify specific actions taken

by particular defendants that could form the basis of [a constitutional] claim").

Estate of Roemer v. Johnson, 764 F. App'x 784, 790-91 (10th Cir. 2019).

“A plaintiff’s failure to satisfy this requirement will trigger swift and certain dismissal.” *Id.* at 790 n.5. Indeed, the Tenth Circuit has “gone so far as to suggest that failure to satisfy the personal-participation requirement will not only justify dismissal for failure to state a claim; it will render the plaintiff’s claim frivolous.” *Id.*

- **Inadequate Medical Treatment**

The Eighth Amendment’s ban on cruel and unusual punishment requires prison officials to “provide humane conditions of confinement” including “adequate . . . medical care.” *Craig v. Eberly*, 164 F.3d 490, 495 (10th Cir. 1998)) (quoting *Barney v. Pulsipher*, 143 F.3d 1299, 1310 (10th Cir. 1998)). To state a cognizable claim under the Eighth Amendment for failure to provide proper medical care, “a prisoner must allege acts or omissions *sufficiently harmful* to evidence deliberate indifference to serious medical needs.” *Olson v. Stotts*, 9 F.3d 1475, 1477 (10th Cir. 1993) (emphasis in original) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

Any Eighth Amendment claim must be evaluated under objective and subjective prongs: (1) “Was the deprivation sufficiently serious?” And, if so, (2) “Did the officials act with a sufficiently culpable state of mind?” *Wilson v. Seiter*, 501 U.S. 294, 298 (1991).

Under the objective prong, a medical need is “sufficiently serious . . .if it is one that has been diagnosed by a physician as mandating treatment or one that is so obvious that even a lay person would easily recognize the necessity for a doctor’s attention.” *Sealock*, 218 F.3d at 1209 (citations & quotation marks omitted).

The subjective component requires the plaintiff to show that prison officials were consciously aware that the prisoner faced a substantial risk of harm and wantonly disregarded the risk “by failing to take reasonable measures to abate it.” *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 847 (1994). “[T]he ‘inadvertent failure to provide adequate medical care’ tantamount to negligence does not satisfy the deliberate indifference standard.” *Sparks v. Singh*, 690 F. App’x 598, 604 (10th Cir. 2017) (unpublished) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 105–06 (1976)). Furthermore, “a prisoner who merely disagrees with a diagnosis or a prescribed course of treatment does not state a constitutional violation.” *Perkins v. Kan. Dep’t of Corrs.*, 165 F.3d 803, 811 10th Cir. 1999); *see also Gee v. Pacheco*, 627 F.3d 1178, 1192 (10th Cir. 2010) (“Disagreement with a doctor’s particular method of treatment, without more, does not rise to the level of an Eighth Amendment violation.”).

- **Failure to Protect**

Plaintiff should consider the following information as he considers an amended complaint:

“A prison official's deliberate indifference to a substantial risk of serious harm to an inmate violates the Eighth Amendment.” *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 828 (1994) (internal quotation marks omitted). These claims include both an objective and a subjective component. *Estate of Booker v. Gomez*, 745 F.3d 429, 430 (10th Cir. 2014) (internal quotation marks omitted) (medical needs); *Riddle v. Mondragon*, 83 F.3d 1197, 1204 (10th Cir. 1996) (failure to protect).

....

For the objective component of a failure-to-protect claim, the prisoner “must show that he is incarcerated under conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm.” *Riddle*, 83 F.3d at 1204 (internal quotation marks omitted). “A prisoner has a right to be reasonably protected from constant threats of violence . . . from other inmates.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

For the subjective component . . . , the prisoner must present "evidence of the prison official's culpable state of mind. He must show that the prison official acted or failed to act despite his knowledge of a substantial risk of serious harm." *Estate of Booker*, 745 F.3d at 430 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted) (medical needs); *see Riddle*, 83 F.3d at 1204 (failure to protect). "[T]he official must have been both aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must have also drawn the inference." *Requena v. Roberts*, 893 F.3d 1195, 1215 (10th Cir. 2018) (brackets, ellipsis, and internal quotation marks omitted).

In addition to the objective and subjective components of these Eighth Amendment claims, a § 1983 "plaintiff must show the defendant personally participated in the alleged violation, and conclusory allegations are not sufficient to state a constitutional violation." *Jenkins v. Wood*, 81 F.3d 988, 994 (10th Cir. 1996) (citation omitted).

Gray v. Sorrels, 744 F. App'x 563, 568 (10th Cir. 2018) (unpublished)

- **Unnecessary Rigor**

Article I, § 9 of the Utah Constitution states in part, "[p]ersons arrested or imprisoned shall not be treated with unnecessary rigor." Although this clause "closely approximates the language of the Eighth Amendment," it has no federal counterpart. *Dexter v. Bosko*, 2008 UT 29, 184 P.3d 592, 595. The Utah Supreme Court has had "few opportunities to interpret or apply the unnecessary rigor." *Id.* Nonetheless, the Utah Supreme Court has held that the unnecessary rigor clause "'protects [prisoners and arrestees] against unnecessary abuse . . . that is 'needlessly harsh, degrading or dehumanizing.'" *Id.* at 595 (quoting *Bott v. Deland*, 922 P.2d 732, 737 (Utah 1996)). To state a claim for a violation of the unnecessary rigor clause, the violation "'must arise from 'treatment that is clearly excessive or deficient and unjustified, not merely the frustrations, inconveniences, and irritations that are common to prison life.'" *Id.* at 597 (quoting *Bott*, 922 P.2d at 741). When the claim of unnecessary rigor arises from an injury, a constitutional violation is made out only when the act complained of presented a substantial risk of serious injury for which there was no reasonable justification at the time. *Id.* (quoting *Bott*, 922 P.2d at 741). The

conduct at issue, moreover, "must be more than negligent to be actionable." *Id.*

In addition to these requirements, a plaintiff must also establish three elements to support an unnecessary rigor claim: (1) "A flagrant violation of his or her constitutional rights;" (2) "Existing remedies do not redress his or her injuries;" and, (3) "Equitable relief, such as an injunction, was and is wholly inadequate to protect the plaintiff's rights or redress his or her injuries." *Id.* at 597-98 (quoting *Spackman v. Bd. of Educ.*, 2000 UT 87, 16 P.3d 533, 538-39 (Utah 2000)).

. . . [However, Plaintiff's] § 1983 claims likely serve as existing remedies that redress his injuries[, mooted the need to also bring an unnecessary rigor claim]."

Asay v. Daggett County, No. 2:18-CV-422, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5794, at * (D. Utah Jan. 11, 2019).

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- (1) The following claims are **DISMISSED**: Claims of rights to grievance process and receipt of requested records.
- (2) The following defendants are **DISMISSED**: John Doe and John Doe 2.
- (3) Plaintiff must within thirty days cure Second Amended Complaint's deficiencies noted above by filing a single document entitled, "Third Amended Complaint." All defendants and claims should be included in a third amended complaint, if filed, and will not be treated further by the Court unless properly included. This is the third and **FINAL** order allowing Plaintiff to cure deficiencies. If a third amended complaint is filed, the Court will screen it for dismissal or service of process.

(4) The Clerk's Office shall mail Plaintiff the Pro Se Litigant Guide with a blank-form civil-rights complaint which Plaintiff must use if Plaintiff wishes to pursue a second amended complaint.

(5) If Plaintiff fails to timely cure the above deficiencies according to this Order's instructions, this action will be dismissed without further notice.


(6) Plaintiff *shall not* try to serve Third Amended Complaint on Defendants; instead the Court will perform its screening function and determine itself whether the amended complaint warrants service. No motion for service of process is needed. *See* 28 U.S.C.S. § 1915(d) (2020) (“The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process, and perform all duties in [*in forma pauperis*] cases.”).

(7) Plaintiff’s motion for appointed counsel, (ECF No. 30), is **DENIED** for the same reasons stated in the Court’s prior Order, (ECF No. 19), denying Plaintiff’s first motion for appointed counsel, (ECF No. 2). As the Court said in that earlier order, “if, after the case develops further, it appears that counsel may be needed or of specific help, the Court may ask an attorney to appear pro bono on Plaintiffs behalf.” (*Id.* at 3.) Because the need for counsel will be continually re-evaluated by the Court as the case progresses, no further motions for counsel should be filed.

(8) Plaintiff’s motion for service of process is **DENIED**. (ECF No. 29.) There is no valid complaint on file as of this Order.

DATED this 3rd day of November, 2020.

BY THE COURT:



JUDGE TENA CAMPBELL
United States District Court