

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jonathan Christopher Coffe v. Singh, et al.

Coffe v. Singh · No. No. 2:24-cv-3247 CKD P · Decided September 9, 2025

OPINION

Singh

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 JONATHAN CHRISTOPHER COFFER, No. 2:24-cv-3247 CKD P

12 Plaintiff,

13 v. ORDER AND

14 SINGH, et al., FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

15 Defendants. 16

17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and seeking relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 18
1983. On March 18, 2025, the court dismissed plaintiff’s amended complaint with leave to file a
19 second amended complaint. Plaintiff has now filed a second amended complaint. 20 The court
is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a 21 governmental
entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The 22 court must
dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally 23
“frivolous or malicious,” that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek
24 monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1),
(2). 25 Plaintiff alleges that while admitted in the San Joaquin General Hospital for weakness 26
resulting from plaintiff starving himself, he fell from his bed and was left unconscious on the 27
floor for 30-45 minutes. Apparently, an alarm should have notified staff of the fall, but the 28 ////
1 volume on the alarm was turned down too low. Plaintiff blames certain defendants who are 2
nurses for not checking the volume on the alarm before plaintiff fell. 3 As plaintiff has been
already informed, conditions of confinement can amount to cruel and 4 unusual punishment and
therefore violate the Eighth Amendment. Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 5 825, 833 (1994). A prison
official may be held liable for subjecting an inmate to harmful 6 conditions of confinement if a
prisoner can show sufficiently serious injury and that the prison 7 official was deliberately
indifferent to the risk of harm. Id. at 834, 837. Thus, the relevant 8 inquiry is whether prison
officials, “acting with deliberate indifference, exposed a prisoner to a 9 sufficiently substantial risk

of serious damage to his future health.” Id. at 834 (internal quotation 10 omitted). 11 Plaintiff does not state a claim under the Eighth Amendment for two reasons. First, 12 plaintiff fails to point to any injury he suffered because of any actions of defendants. To be clear, 13 plaintiff does not blame defendants for his falling, but for leaving him on the floor and does not 14 point to anything that reasonably suggests his remaining on the floor caused him any injury. 15 Second, even if plaintiff did suffer actionable injury, he has not shown it was the result of 16 deliberate indifference. To make such a showing, plaintiff would have to point to facts indicating 17 a defendant knew or should have known that plaintiff would fall from his bed and then be left on 18 the floor. See *Connick v. Thompson*, 563 U.S. 51, 61 (2011) (deliberate indifference standard 19 requires proof that a defendant disregarded a “known or obvious consequence of his action”). 20 This showing has not been made. 21 For these reasons, plaintiff’s second amended complaint must be dismissed. Plaintiff has 22 been given two opportunities to, in good faith, state a claim upon which he can proceed. The 23 court does not give leave to file a third amended complaint because it appears doing so is futile. 24 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 25 1. The Clerk of the Court assign a district court judge to this case. 26 2. Plaintiff’s motion that the court order service of process on defendants (ECF No. 21) is 27 DENIED. 28 // 1 IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that: 2 1. Plaintiff’s second amended complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon 3 || which relief can be granted; and 4 2. This case be closed. 5 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 6 || assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days 7 || after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections 8 | with the court. Such a document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings 9 || and Recommendations.” The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified 10 || time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 11 (9th Cir. 1991). 12 || Dated: September 9, 2025 fi 20 } Kt | / , a he

14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15 16 17 | 1 18 coff3247.frs 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28