
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH

MICHAEL ERNST LEE JOYNER SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SALT LAKE CNTY. SHERIFF'S DEPT' et al.,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM DECISION
& ORDER TO CURE
DEFICIENT COMPLAINT**

Case No. 2:22-CV-217-DBB

District Judge David Barlow

Plaintiff, Salt Lake County inmate Michael Ernest Lee Joyner Sr., brings this *pro se* civil-rights action, *see* 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 (2022).¹ Having now screened the Complaint, (ECF No. 11), under its statutory review function,² the Court orders Plaintiff to file an amended complaint to cure deficiencies before further pursuing claims.

AMENDED COMPLAINT'S DEFICIENCIES

¹ The 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 (2022).

² The 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 (2022).

The Amended Complaint:

(a) is not on the form complaint required by Court.

(b) improperly names Salt Lake County Sheriff's Department and Salt Lake County Jail as § 1983 defendants, when they are not independent legal entities that can sue or be sued. *See Burnett v. Reno Cty. Comm'n*, No. 18-3160-SAC, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32844, at *6 (D. Kan. Mar. 1, 2019) ("Police departments . . . are not suable entities under § 1983, because they lack legal identities apart from the municipality.") (quotation marks and citations omitted); *Smith v. Lawton Corr. Facility*, No. CIV-18-110-C, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45488, at *5 (W.D. Okla. Mar. 7, 2018) (stating correctional facilities "not suable entities in a § 1983 action").

(c) does not adequately affirmatively link defendants to allegations of civil-rights violations. (See below.)

(d) possibly inappropriately alleges civil-rights violations on respondeat-superior theory--i.e., supervisor liability. (See below.)

(e) needs clarification for stating failure-to-protect claim. (See below.)

(f) has claims possibly based on conditions and fact of current confinement; however, the complaint was apparently not submitted using 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)).

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 the original complaint or any other document outside the complaint. *See Murray v. Archambo*, 132 F.3d 609, 612 (10th Cir. 1998) (stating amended complaint supersedes original); *McKnight v. Douglas Cty. Corr. Facility*, No. 21-3030-SAC, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118659, at *7 n.1 (D. Kan. June 25, 2021) ("An Amended Complaint is not simply an addendum to the original complaint, and instead completely supersedes it. Therefore, any claims or allegations not included in the Amended Complaint are no longer before the court. Plaintiff may not simply refer to an earlier pleading, and the Amended Complaint must contain all allegations and claims that Plaintiff intends to pursue in this action, including those to be retained from the original complaint.").

The amended complaint may also not be added to by any other document after it is filed without moving for further amendment.³ Instead, all claims and information must be included in an amended complaint, if one is filed. No material outside the complaint will be treated as additional claims or defendants.

(2) The complaint must (a) "name every defendant in the caption of the amended complaint," *McKnight*, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118659, at *7 n.1 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 10 ("The title of the complaint must name all the parties . . .")), and (b) clearly state in the body of the complaint 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 closely as possible, specific locations, circumstances, and dates of alleged constitutional violations. *McKnight*, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118659, at *7 n.1.

³ The 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:

(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.

(3) Each cause of action, 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). Presented with such a complaint, 'a defendant seeking to respond to plaintiff's conclusory allegations . . . would have little idea where to begin.' *Id.*").

(4) Grievance denial alone, unconnected to 'violation of constitutional rights alleged by plaintiff, does not establish personal participation under § 1983." *Gallagher v. Shelton*, 587 F.3d 1063, 1069 (10th Cir. 2009).

(5) "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) (2022). 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 – Personal Participation**

Regarding naming defendants and linking each of them to the specific behavior that constitutes a cause of action:

[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 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 district court's analysis of plaintiff's § 1983 claims was "infirm" when 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 [of pleading personal participation by each defendant] will trigger swift and certain dismissal." *Id.* at 790 n.5. 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.*

• **Respondeat Superior – Supervisor Liability**

Plaintiff may not validly assert claims against a defendant based solely on the defendant's supervisory position. *See Mitchell v. Maynard*, 80 F.2d 1433, 1441 (10th Cir. 1996) (stating supervisory status alone does not support § 1983 liability).

Further,

[t]o establish *Bivens* liability, [Plaintiff] must provide evidence that an individual directly and personally participated in the purported constitutional violation. *Pahls*, 718 F.3d at 1226. "Government officials may not be held liable for the unconstitutional conduct of their subordinates under a theory of *respondeat superior*." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676.

Watson 741 F. App'x at 551.

• 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).

MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL

The Court now addresses Plaintiff's motion for the Court to ask *pro bono* counsel to represent Plaintiff. 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 plaintiffs. *See* 28 U.S.C.S. § 1915(e)(1) (2020); *Carper*, 54 F.3d at 617; *Williams v. Meese*, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991). Plaintiff bears the burden of convincing the Court that Plaintiff's claim has enough merit to warrant appointment of counsel. *McCarthy v. Weinberg*, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985).

In deciding whether to ask counsel to represent Plaintiff free of charge, this Court considers a variety of factors, like "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 motion for appointed counsel.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

(1) Plaintiff must within thirty days cure the Complaint's deficiencies noted above by filing a document entitled, "Amended Complaint."

(2) 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 an amended complaint.

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

(4) Plaintiff *shall not* try to serve the 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) (2022) ("The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process, and perform all duties in [*in forma pauperis*] cases.").

(5) Plaintiff must tell the Court of any address change and timely comply with Court orders. *See* D. Utah Civ. R. 83-1.3(e) ("In all cases, counsel and parties appearing *pro se* must notify the clerk's office immediately of any change in address, email address, or telephone number."). Failure to do so may result in this action's dismissal for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) ("If the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order, a defendant may move to dismiss the action or any claim against it. Unless the dismissal order states otherwise, a dismissal under this subdivision (b) and any dismissal not under this rule-- except one for lack of jurisdiction, improper venue, or failure to join a party under Rule 19-- operates as an adjudication on the merits.").

(6) Extensions of time are disfavored, though reasonable extensions may be granted. Any motion for time extension must be filed no later than **fourteen days** before the deadline to be extended.

(7) No direct communication is to take place with any judge. Any letters, documents, and papers, labeled with case number, are to be directed to the Clerk of Court.

(8) Plaintiff's motion for appointed counsel is **DENIED**, (ECF No. 12); 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.

DATED this 4th day of August, 2022.

BY THE COURT:



JUDGE DAVID BARLOW
United States District Court