

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

John Patrick Smylie v. Plumas County District Attorney's Office, et
al.

No. 2:25-cv-2064 DC CSK P (E.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2025) · No. No. 2:25-cv-2064 DC CSK P · Decided August 27,
2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted John Patrick Smylie’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and assessed the statutory filing fee. The court screened his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint and dismissed it with leave to amend, concluding that the claims against the prosecutor were barred by absolute prosecutorial immunity and that the claims against the Plumas County District Attorney’s Office lacked sufficient allegations. The court ordered plaintiff to file an amended complaint within thirty days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chi Soo Kim
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 27, 2025
DOCKET	No. 2:25-cv-2064 DC CSK P
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A county prisoner proceeding pro se brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for damages and sought leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and dismissed it with leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must dismiss a prisoner's complaint or claim that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court accepts well-pleaded allegations as true and construes the complaint in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, while requiring factual allegations sufficient to provide fair notice and raise the right to relief above the speculative level.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive rather than precedential value.
PARTIES	John Patrick Smylie v. Plumas County District Attorney's Office, David Drury Hollister

TOPICS

[section 1983](#)
[prisoners rights](#)
[pleadings](#)
[civil procedure](#)
[government liability](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[Civil rights](#)
[Federal civil procedure](#)
[Prisoner litigation](#)
[Prosecutorial immunity](#)
[Municipal liability](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a cognizable § 1983 damages claim based on the prosecutor's plea-bargaining conduct.
2. Whether the prosecutor was absolutely immune from damages liability for allegedly false, defamatory, or other statements made during judicial criminal proceedings.
3. Whether the excessive-sentence allegation stated a claim when no defendant was linked to it and any claim against the sentencing judge would concern a judicial act.
4. Whether the complaint adequately alleged municipal or organizational liability against the Plumas County District Attorney's Office.

HOLDINGS

1. A prosecutor is absolutely immune from § 1983 damages liability for conduct related to plea bargaining because plea bargaining is intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process.
2. A prosecutor is absolutely immune from § 1983 damages liability for false or defamatory statements made during judicial proceedings and for presenting the state's case during the judicial phase of a criminal prosecution.
3. The excessive-sentence allegation failed to state a claim because plaintiff did not connect any defendant to the alleged constitutional deprivation; moreover, a claim for damages against the sentencing judge based on the judicial act of sentencing would be barred by judicial immunity.
4. The claims against the Plumas County District Attorney's Office were inadequately pleaded because the complaint contained no allegations against the office and did not identify a municipal policy or custom that caused a constitutional violation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Prosecutorial immunity extends to the process of plea bargaining.” (at 3)

“a municipality cannot be held liable solely because it employs a tortfeasor—or, in other words, a municipality cannot be held liable under § 1983 on a respondeat superior theory.” (at 5)

“an amended complaint supersedes the original, the latter being treated thereafter as non-existent.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that prosecutor David Drury Hollister offered him a plea agreement for sixteen months in prison with no parole or probation, but that plaintiff was later subjected to parole and GPS monitoring. Plaintiff also alleged that Hollister made false, defamatory, or taunting statements during criminal court proceedings, including statements concerning plaintiff's parole-agent altercation, evaluation date, sex-offender registration, suicide attempts, and injuries. The complaint also referred to an excessive sentence without linking that allegation to a defendant and named the Plumas County District Attorney's Office without alleging conduct by the office.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a prisoner civil-rights complaint naming the Plumas County District Attorney's Office and prosecutor David Drury Hollister. The court granted in forma pauperis status, assessed the statutory filing fee and initial partial fee, screened the complaint, and dismissed the claims because the prosecutor was absolutely immune from damages for the alleged conduct and the claims against the district attorney's office lacked sufficient allegations. Plaintiff was granted thirty days to file an amended complaint.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327 (1989)
- Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227-28 (9th Cir. 1984)
- Jackson v. Arizona, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130-31 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)
- Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007)
- Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974)
- Kalina v. Fletcher, 522 U.S. 118, 126, 131 (1997)
- Genzler v. Longanbach, 410 F.3d 630, 636 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Buckley v. Fitzsimmons, 509 U.S. 259, 269-70 (1993)
- Patterson v. Van Arsdell, 883 F.3d 826, 830 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Briley v. California, 564 F.2d 849, 856 (9th Cir. 1977)
- Pfeiffer v. Hartford Fire Insurance Co., 929 F.2d 1484, 1492 (10th Cir. 1991)
- Taylor v. Kavanagh, 640 F.2d 450, 453 (2d Cir. 1981)
- Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 691 (1978)

- Rizzo v. Goode, 423 U.S. 362 (1976)
- Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978)
- Fayle v. Stapley, 607 F.2d 858, 862 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Mosher v. Saalfeld, 589 F.2d 438, 441 (9th Cir. 1978)
- Ivey v. Board of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 227-29 (1988)
- Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 356 (1978)
- Burns v. Reed, 500 U.S. 478, 490 (1991)
- Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409, 430-31 (1976)
- Aguaristi v. County of Merced, 2019 WL 330908, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2019)
- Oviatt By and Through Waugh v. Pearce, 954 F.2d 1470, 1474 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Ramirez v. County of San Bernardino, 806 F.3d 1002, 1008 (9th Cir. 2015)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
 CALIFORNIA 10 11 JOHN PATRICK SMYLIE, No. 2:25-cv-2064 DC CSK P 12 Plaintiff,
 ORDER 13 v. 14 PLUMAS COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE, et al., 15 Defendants.
 16 17 I. INTRODUCTION 18 Plaintiff is a county prisoner proceeding pro se. Plaintiff seeks
 relief pursuant to 19 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and requested leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant
 to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

20 This proceeding was referred to this Court by Local Rule 302 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)
 (1). 21 Plaintiff submitted a declaration that makes the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).
 22 Accordingly, the request to proceed in forma pauperis is granted. 23 Plaintiff is required to pay
 the statutory filing fee of \$350.00 for this action. 28 U.S.C. 24 §§ 1914(a), 1915(b)(1).

By this order, plaintiff is assessed an initial partial filing fee in 25 accordance with the provisions
 of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). By separate order, the court will direct 26 the appropriate agency to
 collect the initial partial filing fee from plaintiff’s trust account and 27 forward it to the Clerk of
 the Court. Thereafter, plaintiff is obligated to make monthly payments 28 of twenty percent of the
 preceding month’s income credited to plaintiff’s trust account.

These 1 payments will be forwarded by the appropriate agency to the Clerk of the Court each time
 the 2 amount in plaintiff’s account exceeds \$10.00, until the filing fee is paid in full. 28 U.S.C. 3 §
 1915(b)(2). 4 As discussed below, plaintiff’s complaint is dismissed with leave to amend. 5 II.
 SCREENING STANDARDS 6 The court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners
 seeking relief against a 7 governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.

28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The 8 court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner
 raised claims that are legally 9 “frivolous or malicious,” that fail to state a claim upon which relief

may be granted, or that seek 10 monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), (2). 11 A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.

12 *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227-28 (9th Cir. 1984). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous when it is based on an 14 indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Neitzke*, 15 490 U.S. at 327.

The critical inquiry is whether a constitutional claim, however inartfully 16 pleaded, has an arguable legal and factual basis. See *Jackson v. Arizona*, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1989), superseded by statute as stated in *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130-31 (9th Cir. 18 2000) (“[A] judge may dismiss [in forma pauperis] claims which are based on indisputably 19 meritless legal theories or whose factual contentions are clearly baseless.”); *Franklin*, 745 F.2d at 20 1227.

21 Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure “requires only ‘a short and plain 22 statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,’ in order to ‘give the 23 defendant fair notice of what the... claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.”” *Bell Atlantic 24 Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)).

25 In order to survive dismissal for failure to state a claim, a complaint must contain more than “a 26 formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action;” it must contain factual allegations 27 sufficient “to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Bell Atlantic*, 550 U.S. at 555. 28 However, “[s]pecific facts are not necessary; the statement [of facts] need only ‘give the 1 defendant fair notice of what the... claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.’” *Erickson v. 2 Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007) (quoting *Bell Atlantic*, 550 U.S. at 555, citations and internal 3 quotations marks omitted).

In reviewing a complaint under this standard, the court must accept as 4 true the allegations of the complaint in question, *Erickson*, 551 U.S. at 93, and construe the 5 pleading in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236 6 (1974), overruled on other grounds, *Davis v. Scherer*, 468 U.S. 183 (1984). 7 III. DISCUSSION 8 Named as defendants are the Plumas County District Attorney’s Office and Plumas 9 County District Attorney David Drury Hollister.

(ECF No. 1 at 2.) Plaintiff’s complaint contains 10 three claims for relief and seeks money damages. 11 A. Claim One 12 Plaintiff alleges that on December 16, 2022, plaintiff accepted a plea offer from defendant 13 Hollister for 16 months in prison with no parole and no probation. (Id.) Plaintiff appears to claim 14 that defendant Hollister offered this plea knowing that the California Department of Corrections 15 and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”) would not uphold the terms of the plea agreement.

(Id. at 3.) Upon 16 release from CDCR custody, plaintiff was forced to report to parole and was placed on GPS 17 monitoring for two years, in violation of the plea agreement. (Id.) Plaintiff alleges that defendant 18 Hollister knew that the plea agreement was illegal and tricked plaintiff into entering it. (Id.) 19 Plaintiff also alleges that in October 2024, plaintiff was incarcerated for being under the influence 20 and given an excessive thirty day sentence.

(Id.) 21 A state prosecutor is absolutely immune from § 1983 actions “when performing the 22 traditional functions of an advocate.” *Kalina v. Fletcher*, 522 U.S. 118, 131(1997). “Prosecutors 23 are entitled to qualified immunity, rather than absolute immunity, when they perform 24 administrative functions, or ‘investigative functions normally performed by a detective or police 25 officer.’” *Genzler v. Longanbach*, 410 F.3d 630, 636 (9th Cir.

2005) (quoting *Kalina*, 522 U.S. at 26 126)). When determining whether a prosecutor is entitled to absolute or qualified immunity for 27 their actions, a court should focus on “the nature of the function performed.” *Buckley v. 28 Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259, 269 (1993). “In applying this approach, [the court] distinguish[es] 1 between acts of advocacy, which are entitled to absolute immunity, and administrative and 2 ‘police-type’ investigative acts which are not.

To qualify as advocacy, an act must be ‘intimately 3 associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process.’” *Patterson v. Van Arsdell*, 883 F.3d 4 826, 830 (9th Cir. 2018) (citation omitted). 5 In claim one, plaintiff alleges that defendant Hollister entered into an unenforceable plea 6 agreement with plaintiff.

The Ninth Circuit has held that “[p]rosecutorial immunity extends to 7 the process of plea bargaining.” *Briley v. California*, 564 F.2d 849, 856 (9th Cir. 1977) (citation 8 omitted); see also *Pfeiffer v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.*, 929 F.2d 1484, 1492 (10th Cir. 1991) (plea 9 bargaining is “an activity that is absolutely immune from liability due to its intimate association 10 with the judicial process.”); *Taylor v Kavanagh*, 640 F.2d 450, 453 (2d Cir.

1981) (extending the 11 doctrine of absolute immunity to prosecutor’s plea bargaining activities). Thus, defendant 12 Hollister has absolute immunity for his conduct related to the plea agreement. 13 In claim one, plaintiff also alleges that in October 2024, plaintiff received an excessive 14 sentence. No defendants are linked to this claim.

The Civil Rights Act under which this action 15 was filed provides as follows: 16 Every person who, under color of [state law]... subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States... to the deprivation 17 of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution... shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, 18 or other proper proceeding for redress.

19 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The statute requires that there be an actual connection or link between the 20 actions of the defendants and the deprivation alleged to have been suffered by plaintiff. See 21

Monell v. Department of Social Servs., 436 U.S. 658 (1978); Rizzo v. Goode, 423 U.S. 362 (1976). “A person ‘subjects’ another to the deprivation of a constitutional right, within the meaning of § 1983, if he does an affirmative act, participates in another's affirmative acts or omits to perform an act which he is legally required to do that causes the deprivation of which complaint is made.” Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir.

1978). 26 Moreover, supervisory personnel are generally not liable under § 1983 for the actions of 27 their employees under a theory of respondeat superior and, therefore, when a named defendant 28 holds a supervisory position, the causal link between him and the claimed constitutional 1 violation must be specifically alleged. See Fayle v. Stapley, 607 F.2d 858, 862 (9th Cir.

1979); 2 Mosher v. Saalfeld, 589 F.2d 438, 441 (9th Cir. 1978), cert. denied, 442 U.S. 941 (1979). Vague 3 and conclusory allegations concerning the involvement of official personnel in civil rights 4 violations are not sufficient. See Ivey v. Board of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982). 5 Plaintiff’s claim regarding the alleged excessive sentence is dismissed because no 6 defendants are linked to this claim.

To the extent plaintiff intends to name as a defendant the 7 judge who imposed the alleged excessive sentence, judges are absolutely immune from damages 8 liability for acts which are judicial in nature. See Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 227-29 9 (1988). Judicial immunity does not extend to acts taken in the “clear absence of all jurisdiction.” 10 Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 356 (1978).

Because sentencing is judicial in nature, a claim 11 against a judge for imposing an excessive sentence will be dismissed on the grounds that the 12 judge is entitled to absolute immunity. 13 B. Claim Two 14 Plaintiff alleges that on May 16, 2025, while in court, defendant Hollister deliberately 15 made a false statement, claiming that plaintiff had an altercation with plaintiff’s parole agent that 16 resulted in plaintiff’s arrest.

(ECF No. 1 at 4.) Plaintiff also alleges that on April 21, 2025, 17 defendant Hollister falsely told the court that the date of plaintiff’s evaluation ordered by the 18 court was unknown. (Id.) Plaintiff alleges that because the evaluation of plaintiff resulted in a 19 diagnosis that defendant Hollister did not like, defendant Hollister questioned the date of the 20 evaluation in order to confuse the judge, which led to multiple hearings and caused plaintiff to be 21 denied diversionary sentencing on June 6, 2025.

(Id.) Plaintiff alleges that “this question” lasted 22 four court dates. (Id.) 23 Prosecutors enjoy absolute immunity for “making false or defamatory statements in 24 judicial proceedings[.]” Burns v. Reed, 500 U.S. 478, 490 (1991).

Thus, defendant Hollister is 25 entitled to absolute immunity for plaintiff’s claim alleging that defendant Hollister made false 26 statements to the court regarding the date of plaintiff’s

evaluation and that plaintiff had an 27 altercation with his parole agent. 28 /// 1 C. Claim Three 2 Plaintiff alleges that on May 16, 2025, defendant Hollister twice maliciously called 3 plaintiff a “290” in court.1 (ECF No. 1 at 5.)

Plaintiff alleges that plaintiff’s public defender had 4 informed the court that plaintiff was mistreated in custody because defendant Hollister called 5 plaintiff a “290” in court in November 2022. (Id.) Plaintiff alleges that on May 30, 2025, 6 Sergeant Gott arrived at the courthouse stating that a tip was made that someone was going to act 7 out. (Id.) Defendant Hollister made taunting remarks toward plaintiff, stating that plaintiff was a 8 danger to others because of suicidal attempts.

(Id.) Defendant Hollister said, “where he got the 9 worst of it,” when discussing an altercation between plaintiff and another person that resulted in 10 plaintiff getting staples in the back of his head. (Id.) Plaintiff alleges that on June 6, 2025, 11 defendant Hollister also taunted plaintiff in court. (Id.) 12 To the extent plaintiff alleges that defendant Hollister made false or defamatory 13 statements against plaintiff in court, defendant Hollister is entitled to absolute immunity.

See 14 Burns, 500 U.S. at 490. In claim three, plaintiff also appears to challenge statements made by 15 defendant Hollister in court regarding plaintiff that were true, i.e., that plaintiff was required to 16 register as a sex offender, that plaintiff had attempted suicide and that plaintiff suffered injuries 17 during an altercation. Prosecutors are absolutely immune from damages under § 1983 for their 18 conduct in “initiating a prosecution and in presenting the State’s case” insofar as that conduct is 19 “intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process.” Buckley v. Fitzsimmons, 20 509 U.S. 259, 270 (1993) (quoting Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409, 430-31 (1976)).

Defendant 21 Hollister’s alleged comments regarding plaintiff that were true were made during the judicial 22 phase of the criminal process in that they were made during court proceedings. For this reason, 23 defendant Hollister is entitled to absolute immunity for making these alleged comments. 24 D. Defendant Plumas County District Attorney’s Office 25 The complaint contains no allegations against defendant Plumas County District 26 Attorney’s Office.

For this reason, the claims against defendant Plumas County District 27 1 In referring to “290,” plaintiff appears to refer to California Penal Code § 290, the California 28 Sex Offender Registration Act. 1 Attorney’s Office are dismissed with leave to amend. Assuming that the Plumas County District 2 Attorney’s Office is properly subject to suit under section 1983, akin to a municipality, “[i]t is 3 well established that ‘a municipality cannot be held liable solely because it employs a 4 tortfeasor—or, in other words, a municipality cannot be held liable under § 1983 on a respondeat 5 superior theory.’” Aguaristi v. County of Merced, 2019 WL 330908, at *3 (E.D.

Cal. Jan. 25, 6 2019) (quoting *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 691 (1978)). Generally, to establish 7 municipal liability, the plaintiff must show that a constitutional right was violated, the 8 municipality had a policy, that policy was deliberately indifferent to plaintiff's constitutional 9 rights, and the policy was "the moving force" behind the constitutional violation.

See *Oviatt By 10 and Through Waugh v. Pearce*, 954 F.2d 1470, 1474 (9th Cir. 1992) (citing *City of Canton v. 11 Harris*, 489 U.S. 378, 389-91 (1989)). If plaintiff files an amended complaint naming Plumas 12 County District Attorney's Office as a defendant, plaintiff shall address the legal standards set 13 forth above. 14 IV. LEAVE TO AMEND 15 In an abundance of caution, plaintiff's complaint is dismissed with leave to amend.

An 16 amended complaint should not include the claims against defendant Hollister for which this Court 17 found above that defendant Hollister was entitled to absolute immunity. If plaintiff files an 18 amended complaint, plaintiff is informed that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to 19 make plaintiff's amended complaint complete. Local Rule 220 requires that an amended 20 complaint be complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading.

This requirement exists 21 because, as a general rule, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint. See *Ramirez 22 v. Cnty. of San Bernardino*, 806 F.3d 1002, 1008 (9th Cir. 2015) ("an 'amended complaint 23 supersedes the original, the latter being treated thereafter as non-existent.'" (internal citation 24 omitted)). Once plaintiff files an amended complaint, the original pleading no longer serves any 25 function in the case.

Therefore, in an amended complaint, as in an original complaint, each claim 26 and the involvement of each defendant must be sufficiently alleged. 27 V. CONCLUSION 28 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:] 1. Plaintiff's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is granted. 2 2. Plaintiff is obligated to pay the statutory filing fee of \$350.00 for this action.

Plaintiff 3 || is assessed an initial partial filing fee in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. 4 | § 1915(b)(1). All fees shall be collected and paid in accordance with this court's order to the 5 || Plumas County Sheriff filed concurrently herewith. 6 3. Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed. 7 4. Within thirty days from the date of this order, plaintiff shall complete the attached 8 | Notice of Amendment and submit the following documents to the court: 9 a. The completed Notice of Amendment; and 10 b. An original of the Amended Complaint.

11 | Plaintiffs amended complaint shall comply with the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, the 12 || Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules of Practice. The amended complaint must 13 || also bear the docket number assigned to this case and must be labeled "Amended Complaint." 14 | Failure to file an amended complaint in accordance with this order may result in the dismissal of 15 || this action.

16 17 | Dated: August 27, 2025 A aA i Aan Spe | CHI SOO KIM 19 UNITED STATES
MAGISTRATE JUDGE 20 21 22 | smyto6a.14/2 23 24 25 26 27 28 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED
STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 JOHN
PATRICK SMYLIE, No. 2:25-cv-2064 DC CSK P 11 Plaintiff, 12 v. NOTICE OF AMENDMENT
13 PLUMAS COUNTY DISTRICT 14 ATTORNEY’S OFFICE, et al., 15 Defendants.

16 17 Plaintiff submits the following document in compliance with the court’s order 18 filed on
_____ (date). 19 20 Amended Complaint 21 (Check this box if submitting an Amended
Complaint) 22 DATED: 23 _____ Plaintiff 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/john-patrick-smylie-v-plumas-county-district-attorney-s-9f27sgzk>