

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

Shaun Dupree Dean, Jr. v. Sacramento County, et al.

Shaun Dupree Dean, Jr. v. Sacramento County, No. 2:24-cv-0139 AC P (E.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-0139 AC P · Decided March 6, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants Shaun Dupree Dean Jr.’s applications to proceed in forma pauperis and screens his prisoner civil rights complaint. The court finds a potentially viable Fourteenth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Sacramento County based on an alleged policy or practice of denying necessary medication, but finds the claims against Doe defendants and the negligent-infliction-of-emotional-distress claim insufficiently pleaded. The court gives plaintiff 21 days to elect either to proceed on the screened claim or file an amended complaint.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Allison Claire                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| DECIDED               | March 6, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| DOCKET                | 2:24-cv-0139 AC P                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and state tort law; the court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and ruled on plaintiff’s requests to proceed in forma pauperis.                                                                                                                                                                         |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court screens prisoner complaints against governmental entities and dismisses claims that are frivolous or fail to state a claim. For failure-to-state-a-claim purposes, the court applies the facial-plausibility standard, accepts factual allegations as true, and construes the complaint in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished district court order; nonprecedential                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| PARTIES               | Shaun Dupree Dean, Jr. v. Sacramento County, et al.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |

## TOPICS

prisoners rights   section 1983   fourteenth amendment   municipal liability   civil procedure

## PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights   constitutional law   municipal liability   California tort law   civil procedure

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff adequately stated a Fourteenth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Sacramento County based on an alleged policy or practice of denying necessary medication.
2. Whether plaintiff stated claims against unidentified Doe defendants when he did not allege what any particular Doe defendant did.
3. Whether plaintiff stated a negligent-infliction-of-emotional-distress claim against Sacramento County under California law.
4. Whether plaintiff should be permitted to proceed in forma pauperis.

## HOLDINGS

1. The complaint adequately stated a deliberate-indifference claim under the Fourteenth Amendment against Sacramento County because, liberally construed, it alleged that the County maintained a policy or practice of denying medication needed to treat certain medical conditions.
2. The complaint failed to state claims against the Doe defendants because it did not identify conduct attributable to any particular unidentified defendant.
3. The complaint failed to state a negligent-infliction-of-emotional-distress claim against Sacramento County because plaintiff did not allege negligent conduct by a County employee sufficient for vicarious liability, and the County was immune from direct liability under the allegations presented.
4. Plaintiff's requests to proceed in forma pauperis were granted because his declarations showed that he could not afford to pay the entire filing fee.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*"After conducting the screening required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), the court finds that plaintiff has adequately stated a valid claim for deliberate indifference under the Fourteenth Amendment against defendant Sacramento County."* (Document p. 3)

*"However, the allegations in the complaint are not sufficient to state any claim for relief against any Doe defendants or to state a claim for negligent infliction of emotional distress against Sacramento County."* (Document p. 3)

*"Plaintiff has the option to proceed immediately on his Fourteenth Amendment claim against defendant Sacramento County as set forth in Section III above, or to file an amended complaint."* (Document p. 4)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that he suffered from various physical and mental health conditions while confined in the county jail. He claimed that medical staff denied him adequate care by refusing to provide prescribed or necessary medications and instead supplying ineffective over-the-counter medication, asserting that the jail did not carry the medications he needed. He alleged resulting physical and mental harm and attributed the conduct to a County policy or practice.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, a county inmate proceeding without counsel, filed a complaint alleging inadequate medical care in violation of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments and asserting state-law claims. The court granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis and screened the complaint. It found a Fourteenth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim adequately pleaded against Sacramento County, but found the claims against Doe defendants and the negligent-infliction-of-emotional-distress claim against the County insufficient, while allowing plaintiff either to proceed on the surviving claim or amend.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327 (1989)
- *Jackson v. Arizona*, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1989)
- *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000)
- *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 557, 570 (2007)
- *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam)
- *Jenkins v. McKeithen*, 395 U.S. 411, 421 (1969)
- *Vazquez v. County of Kern*, 949 F.3d 1153, 1163-64 (9th Cir. 2020)
- *Demery v. Arpaio*, 378 F.3d 1020, 1029 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *Rizzo v. Goode*, 423 U.S. 362, 370-71 (1976)
- *Arnold v. Int'l Bus. Machs. Corp.*, 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981)
- *Johnson v. Duffy*, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978)
- *Ivey v. Bd. of Regents*, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- *Loux v. Rhay*, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967)
- *Lacey v. Maricopa County*, 693 F.3d 896, 928 (9th Cir. 2012)
- *Gordon v. County of Orange*, 888 F.3d 1118, 1125 (9th Cir. 2018)
- *Huggins v. Longs Drug Stores Cal., Inc.*, 6 Cal. 4th 124, 129 (1993)
- *Potter v. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.*, 6 Cal. 4th 965, 984 (1993)
- *Marlene F. v. Affiliated Psychiatric Med. Clinic, Inc.*, 48 Cal. 3d 583, 588 (1989)
- *Butler-Rupp v. Lourdeaux*, 134 Cal. App. 4th 1220, 1226 n.1 (2005)

- Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs., 436 U.S. 585, 690, 694 (1978)
- Long v. County of Los Angeles, 442 F.3d 1178, 1185 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Plumeau v. Sch. Dist. No. 40 Cnty. of Yamhill, 130 F.3d 432, 438 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Price v. Sery, 513 F.3d 962, 966 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Ulrich v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco, 308 F.3d 968, 984-85 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Mosier v. Cal. Dep't of Corr. & Rehab., 2012 WL 2577524, at \*3, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92286, at \*8-9 (E.D. Cal. July 2, 2012)
- Robinett v. Correctional Training Facility, 2010 WL 2867696, at \*4, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 76327, at \*12-13 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2010)

## OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA 10 11 SHAUN DUPREE DEAN, JR., No. 2:24-cv-0139 AC P 12 Plaintiff, 13 v.  
ORDER 14 SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff is a county inmate  
who filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 18 and state tort law without a  
lawyer. He has requested leave to proceed without paying the full 19 filing fee for this action,  
under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

Plaintiff has submitted declarations showing 20 that he cannot afford to pay the entire filing fee.  
See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2). Accordingly, 21 plaintiff's motions to proceed in forma pauperis will  
be granted. 22 I. Statutory Screening of Prisoner Complaints 23 The court is required to screen  
complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against "a 24 1 This means that plaintiff is allowed  
to pay the \$350.00 filing fee in monthly installments that are 25 taken from the inmate's trust  
account rather than in one lump sum.

28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a). As 26 part of this order, the prison is required to remove an initial partial  
filing fee from plaintiff's trust account. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). A separate order directed to  
the appropriate agency 27 requires monthly payments of twenty percent of the prior month's  
income to be taken from plaintiff's trust account. These payments will be taken until the \$350  
filing fee is paid in full.

28 See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). 1 governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental  
entity." 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). A 2 claim "is [legally] frivolous where it lacks an arguable basis  
either in law or in fact." Neitzke v. 3 Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

The court may dismiss a claim as frivolous if it is based on 4 an indisputably meritless legal theory  
or factual contentions that are baseless. Id., 490 U.S. at 5 327. The critical inquiry is whether a  
constitutional claim, however inartfully pleaded, has an 6 arguable legal and factual basis. Jackson  
v. Arizona, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1989), 7 superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in  
Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir.

8 2000). 9 In order to avoid dismissal for failure to state a claim a complaint must contain more than 10 “naked assertion[s],” “labels and conclusions,” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a 11 cause of action.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 557 (2007).

In other words, 12 “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory 13 statements, do not suffice.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). A claim upon which the 14 court can grant relief has facial plausibility. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570. “A claim has facial 15 plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable 16 inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citation 17 omitted).

When considering whether a complaint states a claim, the court must accept the 18 allegations as true, *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam), and construe the 19 complaint in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, *Jenkins v. McKeithen*, 395 U.S. 411, 421 20 (1969) (citations omitted). 21 II. Factual Allegations of the Complaint 22 The complaint alleges that defendants Sacramento County and Does 1-20 have violated 23 plaintiff’s rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, 24 as well as state tort law.

ECF No. 1. 24 2 Plaintiff cites both the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments but does not specify whether he was 25 a pretrial detainee or convicted prisoner at the time of the alleged violation. Since he appears to 26 have been a pretrial detainee, the undersigned will assume, for screening purposes, that his claims are governed by the less rigorous Fourteenth Amendment standard.

See *Vazquez v. County of 27 Kern*, 949 F.3d 1153, 1163-64 (9th Cir. 2020) (“[T]he Fourteenth Amendment is more protective than the Eighth Amendment ‘because the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits all punishment of 28 (continued) 1 Specifically, plaintiff alleges that he suffers from various physical and mental health conditions 2 and medical staff at the jail have denied him adequate care by refusing to give him proper 3 medication to treat his conditions, instead providing over the counter medications that do not do 4 anything.

*Id.* at 3-5, 7-8. He has been told that the jail does not carry the medications he requires 5 and there is nothing that can be done. *Id.* at 4. Plaintiff has suffered both mentally and physically 6 as a result of the failure to provide him with his correct medication. *Id.* at 3-5, 8. 7 III. Claims for Which a Response Will Be Required 8 After conducting the screening required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), the court finds that 9 plaintiff has adequately stated a valid claim for deliberate indifference under the Fourteenth 10 Amendment against defendant Sacramento County.

Liberally construed, plaintiff has sufficiently 11 alleged that the county has a policy or practice of denying treatment for certain medical 12 conditions by refusing to provide the medication needed to treat those conditions. 13 IV. Failure to State a Claim 14 However, the allegations in the

complaint are not sufficient to state any claim for relief 15 against any Doe defendants or to state a claim for negligent infliction of emotional distress 16 against Sacramento County.

Plaintiff fails to make any specific allegations against any Doe 17 defendant and therefore fails to state any claims for relief against any of them. Because plaintiff 18 has not alleged facts showing any Doe defendant negligently inflicted emotional distress, he does 19 not state a claim against the county for negligent infliction of emotional distress based on 20 vicarious liability, and the county is immune from a claim based on direct liability.

It appears to 21 the court that plaintiff may be able to allege facts to fix these problems. Therefore, plaintiff has 22 the option of filing an amended complaint. 23 V. Options from Which Plaintiff Must Choose 24 Based on the court's screening, plaintiff has a choice to make.

After selecting an option 25 from the two options listed below, plaintiff must return the attached Notice of Election form to 26 27 pretrial detainees, while the Eighth Amendment only prevents the imposition of cruel and unusual punishment of convicted prisoners.'” (quoting *Demery v. Arpaio*, 378 F.3d 1020, 1029 28 (9th Cir. 2004))). 1 the court within 21 days from the date of this order.

2 The first option available to plaintiff is to proceed immediately against defendant 3 Sacramento County on his Fourteenth Amendment claim. By choosing this option, plaintiff 4 will be agreeing to voluntarily dismiss the Doe defendants and the negligent infliction of 5 emotional distress claim against Sacramento County.

The court will proceed to 6 immediately serve the complaint and order a response from defendant Sacramento County 7 on the Fourteenth Amendment claim. 8 The second option available to plaintiff is to file an amended complaint to fix the 9 problems described in Section IV. If plaintiff chooses this option, the court will set a 10 deadline in a subsequent order to give plaintiff time to file an amended complaint.

11 VI. Plain Language Summary of this Order for Party Proceeding Without a Lawyer 12 Some of the allegations in the complaint state claims against the defendants and some do 13 not. You have stated a claim for deliberate indifference against Sacramento County based its 14 policy of not providing certain necessary medications. You have not stated claims against any 15 Doe defendants because you have not identified what any particular unidentified person did.

You 16 also have not stated a claim for negligent infliction of emotional distress against Sacramento 17 County because the county has immunity on a direct liability theory, and you have not shown any 18 county employee negligently inflicted emotional distress in order to show vicarious liability. 19 You have a choice to make. You may either (1) proceed immediately on your deliberate 20 indifference claim against Sacramento County and voluntarily dismiss the other claims and 21 defendants or (2) try to amend the complaint.

To decide whether to amend your complaint, the court has attached the relevant legal standards that may govern your claims for relief. See Attachment A. Pay particular attention to these standards if you choose to file an amended complaint. CONCLUSION In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiff's requests for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF Nos. 2, 8) are GRANTED.

2. Plaintiff is obligated to pay the statutory filing fee of \$350.00 for this action. Plaintiff is assessed an initial partial filing fee in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). All fees shall be collected and paid in accordance with this court's order to the appropriate agency filed concurrently herewith. 3. Plaintiff's requests for screening (ECF Nos. 5, 7) are GRANTED to the extent the complaint has now been screened.

4. Plaintiff's claims against the Doe defendants and his claim for negligent infliction of emotional distress against Sacramento County do not state claims for which relief can be granted. 5. Plaintiff has the option to proceed immediately on his Fourteenth Amendment claim against defendant Sacramento County as set forth in Section III above, or to file an amended complaint.

6. Within 21 days from the date of this order, plaintiff shall complete and return the attached Notice of Election form notifying the court whether he wants to proceed on the screened complaint or whether he wants to file an amended complaint. 7. If plaintiff does not return the form, the court will assume that he is choosing to proceed on the complaint as screened and will recommend dismissal without prejudice of the Doe defendants and the negligent infliction of emotional distress claim against Sacramento County.

DATED: AC/kw:dean0139.14.option UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SHAUN DUPREE DEAN, JR., No. 2:24-cv-0139 AC P Plaintiff, v. NOTICE OF ELECTION SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al., Defendants. Check one: \_\_\_\_\_ Plaintiff wants to proceed immediately on his Fourteenth Amendment claim against defendant Sacramento County without amending the complaint.

Plaintiff understands that by choosing this option, the Doe defendants and negligent infliction of emotional distress claim against defendant Sacramento County will be voluntarily dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a). \_\_\_\_\_ Plaintiff wants time to file an amended complaint. DATED: \_\_\_\_\_ Shaun Dupree Dean, Jr. Plaintiff pro se Attachment A This Attachment provides, for informational purposes only, the legal standards that may apply to your claims for relief.

Pay particular attention to these standards if you choose to file an amended complaint. I. Legal Standards Governing Amended Complaints If plaintiff chooses to file an amended complaint, he

must demonstrate how the conditions 7 about which he complains resulted in a deprivation of his constitutional rights. *Rizzo v. Goode*, 8 423 U.S. 362, 370-71 (1976).

Also, the complaint must specifically identify how each named 9 defendant is involved. *Arnold v. Int'l Bus. Machs. Corp.*, 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981). 10 There can be no liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 unless there is some affirmative link or 11 connection between a defendant's actions and the claimed deprivation. *Id.*; *Johnson v. Duffy*, 12 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir.

1978). Furthermore, "[v]ague and conclusory allegations of official 13 participation in civil rights violations are not sufficient." *Ivey v. Bd. of Regents*, 673 F.2d 266, 14 268 (9th Cir. 1982) (citations omitted). 15 Plaintiff is also informed that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to make 16 his amended complaint complete. See Local Rule 220.

This is because, as a general rule, an 17 amended complaint replaces the prior complaint. *Loux v. Rhay*, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967) 18 (citations omitted), overruled in part by *Lacey v. Maricopa County*, 693 F.3d 896, 928 (9th Cir. 19 2012).

Therefore, in an amended complaint, every claim and every defendant must be included. 20 II. Legal Standards Governing Substantive Claims for Relief 21 A. Fourteenth Amendment Deliberate Indifference 22 A Fourteenth Amendment medical claim includes the following elements: 23 (i) the defendant made an intentional decision with respect to the conditions under which the plaintiff was confined; (ii) those 24 conditions put the plaintiff at substantial risk of suffering serious harm; (iii) the defendant did not take reasonable available measures 25 to abate that risk, even though a reasonable official in the circumstances would have appreciated the high degree of risk 26 involved—making the consequences of the defendant's conduct obvious; and (iv) by not taking such measures, the defendant caused 27 the plaintiff's injuries.

28 *Gordon v. County of Orange*, 888 F.3d 1118, 1125 (9th Cir. 2018). 1 2 B. Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress 3 "Negligent infliction of emotional distress is a form of the tort of negligence, to which the 4 elements of duty, breach of duty, causation and damages apply." *Huggins v. Longs Drug Stores* 5 Cal., Inc., 6 Cal. 4th 124, 129 (1993).

In California "there is no independent tort of negligent 6 infliction of emotional distress. The tort is negligence, a cause of action in which a duty to the 7 plaintiff is an essential element." *Potter v. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.*, 6 Cal. 4th 965, 984 8 (1993) (internal citations omitted).

The existence of a duty is a question of law. *Marlene F. v. 9 Affiliated Psychiatric Med. Clinic, Inc.*, 48 Cal.3d 583, 588 (1989). The elements of a cause of 10 action for negligent infliction of emotional distress are: "1.

The defendant engaged in negligent 11 conduct; 2. The plaintiff suffered serious emotional distress; 3. The defendants' negligent conduct 12 was a cause of the serious emotional distress."

Butler-Rupp v. Lourdeaux, 134 Cal. App. 4th 13 1220, 1226 n.1 (2005). 14 C. County Liability 15 With respect to claims under § 1983, municipalities cannot be held vicariously liable for 16 the actions of their employees.

Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs., 436 U.S. 585, 691, 694 (1978). 17 “Instead, it is when execution of a government’s policy or custom, whether made by its 18 lawmakers or by those whose edicts or acts may fairly be said to represent official policy, inflicts 19 the injury that the government as an entity is responsible under § 1983.” Id. at 694. 20 Municipalities are considered “persons” under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and therefore may be liable for 21 causing a constitutional deprivation.

Id. at 690; Long v. County of Los Angeles, 442 F.3d 1178, 22 1185 (9th Cir. 2006). To properly plead a Monell claim based on an unconstitutional custom, 23 practice, or policy, plaintiff must demonstrate that (1) he possessed a constitutional right of which 24 he was deprived; (2) the municipality had a policy; (3) such policy amounts to deliberate 25 indifference to plaintiff’s constitutional right; and (4) the policy is the moving force behind the 26 constitutional violation.

See Plumeau v. Sch. Dist. No. 40 Cnty. of Yamhill, 130 F.3d 432, 438 27 (9th Cir. 1997). The municipal policy at issue must be the result of a “longstanding practice or 28 custom which constitutes the standard operating procedure of the local government entity.” Price 1 | } v.Sery, 513 F.3d 962, 966 (9th Cir. 2008) (quoting Ulrich v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco, 308 2 | F.3d 968, 984-85 (9th Cir.

2002)). 3 With respect to state tort law claims, “[a] public entity is not liable for an injury, whether 4 | such injury arises out of an act or omission of the public entity or a public employee or any other 5 || person” except as otherwise provided by statute. Cal. Gov’t Code § 815(a). “A public entity is 6 || liable for injury proximately caused by an act or omission of an employee of the public entity 7 || within the scope of his employment if the act or omission would... have given rise to a cause of 8 | action against that employee.” Cal. Gov’t Code § 815.2(a).

9 D. Doe Defendants 10 Although the use of Doe defendants is acceptable to withstand dismissal at the initial 11 || screening stage, service of process for these defendants will not be ordered until such time as 12 | plaintiff has: 1) identified them by their real names through discovery; and, 2) filed a motion to 13 || amend the complaint to substitute their real names.

See Mosier v. Cal. Dep’t of Corr. & Rehab., 14 | 2012 WL 2577524, at \*3, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92286, at \* 8-9 (E.D. Cal. July 2, 2012), 15 | Robinett v. Correctional Training Facility, 2010 WL 2867696, at \*4, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16 | 76327, at \* 12-13 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2010). Additionally, to state a claim against Doe 17 || defendants, plaintiff must allege conduct by each specific Doe defendant to establish liability 18 | under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

This means that plaintiff should identify each Doe defendant separately 19 | (e.g., Doe 1, Doe 2, etc.) and explain what each individual did to violate his rights. 20 | DATED: March 6, 2025 - 21

AMttun—Clone\_ ALLISON CLAIRE 22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 23 24 25 26  
27 28

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/shaun-dupree-dean-jr-v-sacramento-county-et-al-77ig31zs>