

1
2
3
4 The Honorable RONALD B. LEIGHTON
5
6
7
8

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**
11 **AT TACOMA**

12
13
14 JENNY SHERIDAN, a married
woman,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,
18 ELDON VAIL individually and in his
official capacity acting under the color of
state law; and ELEANOR D. VERNELL
19 individually and in her official capacity
acting under the color of state law,
20

21 Defendants.

NO. C10-5459RBL

ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
DISMISS
[Dkt. #15]

22 THIS MATTER is before the Court on the Defendants Mendoza and the State of
23 Washington Department of Corrections' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint
24 [Dkt. # 15]. The Court's prior Order dismissed most of Plaintiff's original claims against all
25 defendants other than Mendoza. [Dkt. #14]. Defendant argues that Plaintiff did not obtain (and
26

1 should not be granted) leave to amend her complaint. They argue that claims addressed in the
2 Court's prior Order have been re-pleaded, and should be dismissed. Defendants also argue that
3 plaintiff's new "public policy against bullying" claim is deficient as a matter of law, and
4 permitting Plaintiff to amend her complaint to include it would be futile.


5
6 Plaintiff's Response [Dkt. #16] addresses only her "public policy against bullying"
7 claim. That claim is based on Plaintiff's argument that RCW 28A.300.285 - "Harrassment,
8 intimidation, and bullying prevention policies and procedures" - reflects an actionable public
9 policy against bullying supporting her workplace "bullying" claim against Defendants.

10 The cited statute relates only to schools, and to the protection of students. It does not
11 expressly or impliedly create a private cause of action for DOC employees to sue for
12 workplace bullying. See *Bennett v. Hardy*, 113 Wash.2d 912, 920, 784 P.2d 1258 (1990)
13 (outlining test for implying statutory private right of action).

14
15 Plaintiff's Amended Complaint was not properly amended, and it fails to state a claim upon
16 which relief may be granted under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). The Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is
17 GRANTED and Plaintiff's Amended Complaint [Dkt. #11] is DISMISSED with prejudice.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DONE this 3rd day of March 2011.

20
21
22 

23 RONALD B. LEIGHTON
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25
26