

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH,
CENTRAL DIVISION

Gary Eatchel v. Jennifer Stansfield, et al.

Eatchel · No. 2:25-cv-197 · Decided December 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Utah screened Gary Eatchel’s pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint and identified deficiencies concerning personal participation, equal protection, due process, retaliation, failure to protect, grievances, and access to legal assistance. The court ordered him to file an amended complaint within ninety days and denied his motion for appointed counsel without prejudice. The court warned that failure to cure the deficiencies could result in dismissal without further notice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Utah, Central Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Tena Campbell
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Utah, Central Division
DECIDED	December 23, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-197
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A self-represented prisoner brought a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After screening the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint curing identified deficiencies and denied without prejudice his motion for appointed counsel.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A for frivolousness, failure to state a claim, and claims seeking monetary relief from immune defendants.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum decision and order
PARTIES	Gary Eatchel v. Jennifer Stansfield, et al.

TOPICS

- pleadings
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure
- due process

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

pleading

appointed counsel

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint satisfied the pleading and personal-participation requirements applicable to a prisoner's § 1983 action.
2. Whether the complaint adequately stated potential equal protection, due process, retaliation, and failure-to-protect claims.
3. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to appointed counsel in the civil action.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint was deficient because it did not affirmatively link specific alleged civil-rights violations to specific defendants or identify what each defendant personally did.
2. Alleged violations of prison policy, state statutes or codes, promises, or ethics rules do not, without more, establish a violation of the federal Constitution.
3. The complaint was deficient because it did not link the elements of the asserted equal protection, due process, retaliation, and failure-to-protect theories to specific named defendants and supporting facts.
4. A prisoner has no independent constitutional right to a state administrative grievance procedure, and denial or mishandling of a grievance alone does not establish personal participation in an underlying constitutional violation.
5. The motion for appointed counsel was denied without prejudice because Plaintiff's claims were not then shown to be colorable, the issues were not complex, and Plaintiff appeared capable of litigating the matter.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Each defendant must be named in the complaint's caption, listed in the section of the complaint setting forth the names of each defendant, and affirmatively linked to applicable claims within the "cause of action" section of the complaint."

"A plaintiff who brings a constitutional claim under § 1983 can't obtain relief without first satisfying the personal participation requirement"

"To prevail on a failure to protect claim, an inmate must show (1) that the conditions of his incarceration present[ed] an objective substantial risk of serious harm and (2) prison officials had subjective knowledge of the risk of harm."

"There is no independent constitutional right to state administrative grievance procedures."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Gary Eatchel, an inmate at the Utah State Correctional Facility, filed a pro se § 1983 complaint against Jennifer Stansfield and other defendants. The complaint apparently relied on alleged violations of promises, prison

policies, state law, ethics rules, grievances, and several asserted constitutional theories, including equal protection, due process, retaliation, and failure to protect. The court found that the pleading did not adequately identify what each defendant did or connect each defendant to the elements of the asserted claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint and a motion for appointed counsel. The district court screened the complaint under the Prison Litigation Reform Act and concluded that the pleading did not adequately link alleged constitutional violations to specific defendants or sufficiently state several potential constitutional claims. The court allowed ninety days to file an amended complaint, warned that failure to cure would result in dismissal, and denied the request for counsel without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Williams v. Miller, 696 F. App'x 862, 870 (10th Cir. 2017)
- Porro v. Barnes, 624 F.3d 1322, 1329 (10th Cir. 2010)
- Hostetler v. Green, 323 F. App'x 653, 657–58 (10th Cir. 2009)
- Hovater v. Robinson, 1 F.3d 1063, 1068 n.4 (10th Cir. 1993)
- Hale v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, 759 F. App'x 741, 752 (10th Cir. 2019)
- Cleveland Board of Education v. Loudermill, 470 U.S. 532, 542 (1985)
- Gallagher v. Shelton, 587 F.3d 1063, 1069 (10th Cir. 2009)
- Boyd v. Werholtz, 443 F. App'x 331, 332 (10th Cir. 2011)
- Dixon v. Bishop, No. CV TDC-19-740, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41678, at *20 (D. Md. Mar. 11, 2020)
- Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343, 356 (1996)
- Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817, 828 (1977)
- TV Communications Network, Inc. v. ESPN, Inc., 767 F. Supp. 1062, 1069 (D. Colo. 1991)
- Hall v. Bellmon, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991)
- Dunn v. White, 880 F.2d 1188, 1197 (10th Cir. 1989)
- Murray v. Archambo, 132 F.3d 609, 612 (10th Cir. 1997)
- Bennett v. Passic, 545 F.2d 1260, 1262–63 (10th Cir. 1976)
- Stone v. Albert, 338 F. App'x 757, 759 (10th Cir. 2009)
- Robbins v. Oklahoma, 519 F.3d 1242, 1248, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 565 n.10 (2007)
- Mitchell v. Maynard, 80 F.3d 1433, 1441 (10th Cir. 1996)
- Jones v. Bock, 549 U.S. 199, 216 (2007)
- Vasquez v. Davis, 882 F.3d 1270, 1275 (10th Cir. 2018)

- *Pahls v. Thomas*, 718 F.3d 1210, 1225 (10th Cir. 2013)
- *Tonkovich v. Kansas Board of Regents*, 159 F.3d 504, 532–33 (10th Cir. 1998)
- *Estate of Roemer v. Johnson*, 764 F. App’x 784, 790–91 & n.5 (10th Cir. 2019)
- *Shero v. City of Grove*, 510 F.3d 1196, 1203 (10th Cir. 2007)
- *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 832–34, 837 (1994)
- *Requena v. Roberts*, 893 F.3d 1195, 1214 (10th Cir. 2018)
- *Pittman v. Kahn*, No. 23-1153, 2024 U.S. App. LEXIS 3043, at *3–4 (10th Cir. Feb. 9, 2024)
- *Johnson v. Johnson*, 466 F.3d 1213, 1217 (10th Cir. 2006)
- *Rachel v. Troutt*, 820 F.3d 390, 397 n.7 (10th Cir. 2016)
- *Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa*, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989)
- *McClelland v. Raemisch*, No. 20-1390, 2021 WL 4469947, at *5 n.3 (10th Cir. Sept. 30, 2021)
- *McCarthy v. Weinberg*, 753 F.2d 836, 838–39 (10th Cir. 1985)
- *Steffey v. Orman*, 461 F.3d 1218, 1223 (10th Cir. 2006)
- *Williams v. Meese*, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991)
- *Greene v. United States Postal Service*, 795 F. App’x 581, 583 (10th Cir. 2019)
- *Gross v. GM LLC*, 441 F. App’x 562, 567 (10th Cir. 2011)
- *Castner v. Colorado Springs Cablevision*, 979 F.2d 1417, 1421 (10th Cir. 1992)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION GARY EATCHEL, MEMORANDUM DECISION AND Plaintiff, ORDER TO CURE DEFICIENT COMPLAINT v. Case No. 2:25-cv-197 JENNIFER STANSFIELD, et al., Judge Tena Campbell Defendants. Plaintiff Gary Eatchel, who is a self-represented inmate at the Utah State Correctional Facility, brings this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.1 The court has screened Mr. Eatchel’s Complaint (ECF No. 1) under its statutory review function.

See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.2 1 The federal statute creating a “civil action for deprivation of rights” reads: 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.

2 The screening statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, 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 The court now orders Mr. Eatchel to file an Amended Complaint to cure the deficiencies of the Complaint before further pursuing his claims.

I. COMPLAINT’S DEFICIENCIES The court notes the following deficiencies and provides guidance below concerning specific issues. The Complaint: (1) does not affirmatively link specific civil rights violations to specific defendants.

(2) does not recognize that the Defendants’ alleged failures to follow promises, jail policy, state statutes and codes, or ethics rules do not necessarily equal federal constitutional violations. See, e.g., *Williams v. Miller*, 696 F. App’x 862, 870 (10th Cir. 2017) (“Merely showing that [defendants] may have violated prison policy is not enough [to show a constitutional violation].” (citations omitted)); *Porro v. Barnes*, 624 F.3d 1322, 1329 (10th Cir.

2010) (noting that plaintiff never sought “to explain how or why the violation of the ... [prison] policy ... necessarily demonstrates” his constitutional rights were breached and that “[i]t is his burden to establish that the Constitution, not just a policy, is implicated” (emphasis in original)); *Hostetler v. Green*, 323 F. App’x 653, 657–58 (10th Cir. 2009) (holding that the defendant’s mere violation of prison regulation did not equate to constitutional violation); *Hovater v. Robinson*, 1 F.3d 1063, 1068 n.4 (10th Cir.

1993) (“[A] failure to adhere to administrative regulations does not equate to a constitutional violation.”). (3) does not adequately link each element of an equal protection claim to specific named defendant(s). See *Hale v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 759 F. App’x 741, 752 (10th Cir. 2019) (explaining that—to state an equal protection claim—a plaintiff must allege facts showing (a) prison officials treated him differently from similarly situated inmates and (b) disparate treatment was not reasonably related to penological interests).

(4) does not adequately link each element of a due process claim to specific named defendant(s). See *Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill*, 470 U.S. 532, 542 (1985) (“An essential principle of due process is that a deprivation of life, liberty, or property be preceded by notice and opportunity for hearing appropriate to the nature of the case.” (cleaned up)).

(5) inappropriately alleges civil rights violations on the basis of denied grievances. See *Gallagher v. Shelton*, 587 F.3d 1063, 1069 (10th Cir. 2009). (6) inappropriately alleges a constitutional right to a grievance process. See *Boyd v. Werholtz*, 443 F. App’x 331, 332 (10th Cir. 2011) (“[T]here is no independent constitutional (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. right to state administrative grievance procedures.

Nor does the state’s voluntary provision of administrative grievance process create a liberty interest in that process.”); *Dixon v. Bishop*, No. CV TDC-19-740, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41678, at *20 (D. Md. Mar. 11, 2020) (“[P]risons do not create a liberty interest protected by the Due

Process Clause when they adopt administrative mechanisms for hearing and deciding inmate complaints[;] any failure to abide by the administrative remedy procedure or to process [grievances] in a certain way does not create a constitutional claim.”).

(7) does not adequately link each element of a retaliation claim to specific named defendant(s). (8) does not adequately link each element of a failure-to-protect claim to specific named defendant(s). (9) includes claims based on current confinement; however, the complaint does not appear to have been submitted using legal help to which the Plaintiff is constitutionally entitled by the Plaintiff’s institution—i.e., the prison contract attorneys.

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))).

II. 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 meeting 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). A. General Considerations Mr. Eatchel should consider these general points before filing an amended complaint: (1) The amended 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 supersedes original). The amended complaint may not be added to after it is filed without moving for amendment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15.

(2) Each defendant must be named in the complaint’s caption, listed in the section of the complaint setting forth the names of each defendant, and affirmatively linked to applicable claims within the “cause of action” section of the complaint.

(3) The complaint must clearly state what each defendant—typically, a named government employee—did to violate Mr. Eatchel’s civil rights. See *Bennett v. Passic*, 545 F.2d 1260, 1262-63 (10th Cir. 1976) (stating personal participation of each named defendant is an essential allegation in a 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, 759 (10th Cir.

2009) (quoting *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008)). Mr. Eatchel should also include, as much as possible, specific dates or at least estimates of when alleged constitutional violations occurred.

(4) Each cause of action, together with the facts and citations that directly support it, should be stated separately. Mr. Eatchel 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 plaintiffs’ conclusory allegations ... would have little idea where to begin.’ *Id.*”). (5) Mr. Eatchel may not name an individual as a defendant based solely on that individual’s supervisory position. See *Mitchell v. Maynard*, 80 F.3d 1433, 1441 (10th Cir. 1996).

(6) The bare denial of a grievance, “by itself without any connection to the 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).

(7) “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. § 1997e(a). But Mr. Eatchel need not include grievance details in his complaint. Failure to exhaust administrative remedies is an affirmative defense that must be raised by Defendants.

Jones v. Bock, 549 U.S. 199, 216 (2007). B. 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) (footnote omitted). “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.* C. Retaliation To properly assert a retaliation claim, Mr. Eatchel must allege three elements: (1) he was involved in “constitutionally protected activity”; (2) the Defendants’ behavior injured him in a way that “would chill a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to engage in that activity”; and (3) the Defendants’ injurious behavior was “substantially motivated” as a reaction to his constitutionally protected conduct.

Shero v. City of Grove, 510 F.3d 1196, 1203 (10th Cir. 2007). D. Failure to Protect The standards governing this type of claim are as follows: The Eighth Amendment imposes a duty on prison officials to provide humane conditions of confinement, including “reasonable measures to guarantee the safety of the inmates.” *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 832 (1994) (quotations omitted).

This obligation includes a duty “to protect prisoners from violence at the hands of other prisoners.” *Id.* at 833 (quotations omitted). “To prevail on a failure to protect claim, an inmate must show (1) that the conditions of his incarceration present[ed] an objective substantial risk of serious harm and (2) prison officials had subjective knowledge of the risk of harm.” *Requena v. Roberts*, 893 F.3d 1195, 1214 (10th Cir.

2018) (quotations omitted). To satisfy the second prong, the inmate must show that the prison official was deliberately indifferent to the inmate’s health or safety. *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834. A prison official will not be liable unless he “knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety; the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference.” *Id.* at 837.

Pittman v. Kahn, No. 23-1153, 2024 U.S. App. LEXIS 3043, at *3–4 (10th Cir. Feb. 9, 2024). III. MOTION FOR APPOINTED COUNSEL Mr. Eatchel also moves for appointed counsel. (ECF No. 3.) “As a civil litigant, [a plaintiff] has no Sixth Amendment right to counsel.” *Johnson v.*

Johnson, 466 F.3d 1213, 1217 (10th Cir. 2006). And the court lacks authority to appoint counsel, although federal statute authorizes the court to ask counsel to agree to represent an indigent plaintiff free of charge.³ See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) (“The court may request an 3 The Tenth Circuit has noted: Each year, the district court receives hundreds of requests for legal representation and only a small number of attorneys are available to accept these requests.

Accordingly, the district court must use discretion in deciding which cases warrant a request for counsel. To do otherwise would deprive clearly deserving litigants of an opportunity to obtain legal representation. The dilemma is unfortunate for litigants [denied counsel]. But the dilemma [i]s not the district court's fault; that dilemma [i]s the product of the court's lack of authority to compel legal representation or to reimburse attorneys for their time.

Rachel v. Troutt, 820 F.3d 390, 397 n.7 (10th Cir. 2016); see also Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for S. Dist. of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989) (holding that courts may not “require an unwilling attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel.”); McClelland v. Raemisch, No. 20-1390, 2021 WL 4469947, at *5 n.3 (10th Cir. Sept. 30, 2021) (explaining that, in a civil case “when [the court] refer[s] to appointing counsel, [the court] really refer[s] to a request that an attorney take the case pro bono”).

Mr. Eatchel bears the burden of convincing the court that his claims have enough merit to warrant the appointment of counsel. McCarthy v. Weinberg, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985). But “[i]t is not enough” for Mr. Eatchel to argue that he needs help “in presenting his strongest possible case, as the same could be said in any case.” Steffey v. Orman, 461 F.3d 1218, 1223 (10th Cir.

2006) (cleaned up). Instead, in deciding whether to ask volunteer counsel to represent Mr. Eatchel free of charge, the court considers a variety of factors, such as “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.” Williams, 926 F.2d at 996; accord McCarthy, 753 F.2d at 838–39.

Considering the above factors, the court concludes that—at this time—Mr. Eatchel’s claims may not be colorable, the issues in this case are not complex, and Mr. Eatchel is not too incapacitated or unable to adequately function in pursuing this matter.

Therefore, at this time the court denies without prejudice Mr. Eatchel’s motion to appoint counsel. attorney to represent an indigent litigant in a civil case”); Greene v. U.S. Postal Serv., 795 F. App’x 581, 583 (10th Cir. 2019) (“In most legal communities, only a limited number of attorneys are willing to take these cases.

Thus, the district court [must] decide how to maximize the benefit from these local resources.”); Gross v. GM LLC, 441 F. App’x 562, 567 (10th Cir. 2011) (observing that courts rarely request counsel to represent parties in civil actions); Castner v. Colo. Springs Cablevision, 979 F.2d 1417,

1421 (10th Cir. 1992) (cautioning courts that indiscriminately appointing “volunteer counsel to undeserving claims will waste a precious resource and may discourage attorneys from donating their time”).

ORDER IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows: 1. Within ninety days, Mr. Eatchel must cure the Complaint’s deficiencies noted above by filing a document titled “Amended Complaint” that does not refer to or include any other document. 2.

The Clerk of Court shall mail Mr. Eatchel the Pro Se Litigant Guide with a blank- form civil rights complaint which Mr. Eatchel must use to pursue an Amended Complaint. 3. If Mr. Eatchel fails to timely cure the above deficiencies according to this Order's instructions, this action will be dismissed without further notice. 4.

The Amended Complaint shall not include any claims outside the dates and allegations of transactions and events contained in the Complaint. The court will not address any such new claims or outside allegations, which will be dismissed. If Mr. Eatchel wishes to raise other claims and allegations, Mr. Eatchel may do so only in a new complaint in a new case. If an Amended Complaint is filed, the court will screen each claim and defendant for dismissal or an order effecting service upon valid defendants who are affirmatively linked to valid claims.

5. Mr. Eatchel must tell the court of any address change and comply in a timely manner with court orders. See D. Utah Civ. R. 83-1.6(b) (“An unrepresented party must immediately notify the Clerk’s Office in writing of any name, mailing address, or email address changes.”). 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. Time extensions are disfavored, although 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. All relevant information, letters, documents, and papers, labeled with case number, are to be directed to the Clerk of Court.

8. Mr. Eatchel must observe this District of Utah local rule: “A party proceeding without an attorney (unrepresented party or pro se party) is obligated to comply with: (1) the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; (2) these Local Rules of Practice; (3) the Utah Standards of Professionalism and Civility; and (4) other laws and rules relevant to the action.” DUCivR 83-1.6(a).

9. Mr. Eatchel's motion for appointed counsel (ECF No. 3) is DENIED. But 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 Mr. Eatchel's behalf.

The court will continually reevaluate the need for counsel; as a result, no further motions for appointed counsel are needed. DATED this 23rd day of December, 2025. BY THE COURT: Sen Compre Tena Campbell United States District Judge 10