

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Black v. Siskiyou County

Black · No. 2:24-cv-3709 DJC CKD P · Decided March 14, 2025

SUMMARY

In this findings and recommendations, the court grants the plaintiff's request for an extension of time and deems his amended complaint timely. The court recommends dismissing the amended complaint because challenges to the plaintiff's competency and pending state criminal proceedings are subject to habeas corpus principles and Younger abstention, and because the complaint fails to state a claim. The court further recommends closing the case without granting leave to amend again.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Carolyn K. Delaney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	March 14, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-3709 DJC CKD P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, moved for an extension of time to file an amended complaint. The magistrate judge granted the extension, deemed the amended complaint timely, screened it under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and recommended dismissal without further leave to amend and closure of the case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A requires dismissal of a prisoner's complaint or claim that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Siva D. Black v. Siskiyou County

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- habeas corpus
- civil procedure
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

federal habeas corpus

criminal procedure

prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint stated a cognizable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
2. Whether a challenge seeking dismissal of pending criminal charges had to be pursued through federal habeas corpus rather than a § 1983 action.
3. Whether Younger abstention required the federal court to refrain from interfering with the pending state criminal competency proceedings.
4. Whether plaintiff should receive a further opportunity to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint was subject to dismissal because it failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted.
2. To the extent plaintiff sought dismissal of the charges against him, his federal remedy lay in an action for a writ of habeas corpus rather than a § 1983 action.
3. Younger abstention applied because the state criminal proceeding was ongoing, implicated important state interests, provided an adequate opportunity to raise constitutional challenges, and the requested relief would interfere with or have the practical effect of interfering with that proceeding.
4. A second opportunity to amend was denied because it did not appear that plaintiff could, in good faith, state a claim upon which he could proceed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Younger abstention is appropriate when the following factors are satisfied: “(1) there is an ongoing state judicial proceeding; (2) the proceeding implicate[s] important state interests; (3) there is an adequate opportunity in the state proceedings to raise constitutional challenges; and (4) the requested relief seek[s] to enjoin or has the practical effect of enjoining the ongoing state judicial proceeding.”” (at 1-2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Siva D. Black was confined at Napa State Hospital after being found unfit to stand trial in Siskiyou County and remanded to the custody of the California Department of State Hospitals. In his amended § 1983 complaint, he challenged the state criminal proceedings, including his competency determination, and sought relief concerning the criminal charges and his competency to stand trial.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Black originally challenged his finding of incompetence to stand trial in Siskiyou County and his commitment to the California Department of State Hospitals. The court granted his request for additional time to amend, but concluded that the amended complaint still failed to state a cognizable § 1983 claim because a challenge to the criminal charges belonged in habeas corpus and a challenge to the pending state competency proceedings was

barred by Younger abstention. The court recommended dismissal and closure, subject to objections and review by the assigned district judge.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973)
- Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 45-46 (1971)
- Arevalo v. Hennessy, 882 F.3d 763, 765 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

(PC) Black v. Siskiyou County

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 SIVA D. BLACK, No. 2:24-cv-3709 DJC CKD P

12 Plaintiff,

13 v. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

14 SISKIYOU COUNTY,

15 Defendant. 16

17 Plaintiff, confined at Napa State Hospital, is proceeding pro se and seeking relief pursuant 18 to
42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff seeks an extension of time within which to file an amended 19
complaint. Good cause appearing, the request for an extension of time will be granted and the 20
amended complaint deemed timely. 21 The court is required to screen complaints brought by
prisoners seeking relief against a 22 governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental
entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The 23 court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the
prisoner has raised claims that are legally 24 “frivolous or malicious,” that fail to state a claim
upon which relief may be granted, or that seek 25 monetary relief from a defendant who is
immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1),(2). 26 As in his original complaint, plaintiff
challenges the fact that he has been found unfit to 27 stand trial in Siskiyou County and remanded
to the custody of the Department of State Hospitals. 28 To the extent petitioner seeks dismissal of
the charges against him, his sole federal remedy lies in 1 an action for a writ of habeas corpus.
Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973). To the 2 extent, he seeks a determination that he is
competent to stand trial, federal courts generally cannot 3 interfere with pending state criminal

proceedings. *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 45-46 (1971). 4 Younger abstention is appropriate when the following factors are satisfied: “(1) there is an 5 ongoing state judicial proceeding; (2) the proceeding implicate[s] important state interests; (3) 6 there is an adequate opportunity in the state proceedings to raise constitutional challenges; and (4) 7 the requested relief seek[s] to enjoin or has the practical effect of enjoining the ongoing state 8 judicial proceeding.” *Arevalo v. Hennessy*, 882 F.3d 763, 765 (9th Cir. 2018) (citation and 9 internal quotations omitted). All of the Younger factors are met. While plaintiff expresses at 10 least frustration with the state court process, he fails to show his ability to raise good faith 11 Constitutional challenges is compromised in any meaningful way. 12 For these reasons, plaintiff’s amended complaint must be dismissed. As it does not appear 13 plaintiff can, in good faith, state a claim upon which he can proceed, the court will not grant leave 14 to amend a second time. 15 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 16 1. Plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 13) is GRANTED. 17 2. Plaintiff’s amended complaint is deemed timely. 18 IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that: 19 1. Plaintiff’s amended complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which 20 relief can be granted; and 21 2. This case be closed. 22 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 23 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days 24 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections 25 with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings 26 and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified 27 // 28 // 1 || time waives the right to appeal the District Court’s order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th 2 | Cir. 1991). 3 || Dated: March 14, 2025 Card Kt | / ye □□□

4 CAROLYNK.DELANEY

5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6 7} blac3709.fis 8 9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28