

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Richard George v. Cisneros, et al.

Richard George v. Cisneros, No. 1:21-cv-00319-KES-BAM (PC) (E.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2025) · No. 1:21-cv-00319-KES-BAM (PC) · Decided October 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California recommends dismissing Richard George’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for failure to state a cognizable claim. The court concludes that the second amended complaint inadequately alleges Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement and equal-protection claims, relies impermissibly on supervisory liability and prison regulations, and does not warrant further leave to amend.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Barbara A. McAuliffe
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	October 9, 2025
DOCKET	1:21-cv-00319-KES-BAM (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Findings and recommendation to dismiss a pro se prisoner civil-rights action at the screening stage for failure to state a claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court screens a prisoner complaint and may dismiss it if it is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The pleading must satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and the facial-plausibility standard of Ashcroft v. Iqbal and Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly. Allegations are accepted as true for screening, but legal conclusions and unwarranted inferences are not.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential findings and recommendation
PARTIES	Richard George v. Theresa Cisneros, Kathleen Allison, Cisneros, et al.

TOPICS

prisoners rights

section 1983

civil rights

constitutional law

pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the second amended complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and the plausibility standard applicable to prisoner screening.
2. Whether the allegations concerning asbestos, mold, algae, mildew, deteriorating fire-sprinkler systems, fire hazards, and inadequate ventilation stated an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim.
3. Whether the complaint stated a § 1983 claim against the warden and prison secretary based on supervisory status or conclusory allegations of knowledge.
4. Whether the complaint stated an equal-protection claim.
5. Whether alleged violations of California prison regulations or Title 15 created a private cause of action under § 1983.
6. Whether dismissal without further leave to amend was warranted after multiple opportunities to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. The second amended complaint failed to provide a plain, factually supported statement of Plaintiff's claims and did not contain sufficient factual matter to make liability plausible.
2. The complaint failed to state a cognizable Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim because it did not plead sufficient facts showing an objectively serious deprivation or that either defendant knew of and deliberately disregarded an excessive risk to Plaintiff's health or safety.
3. The complaint could not impose § 1983 liability on the warden or secretary solely because of their supervisory positions and failed to allege the required causal connection, personal participation, direction, knowledge, or constitutionally deficient policy.
4. The complaint failed to state an equal-protection claim because it did not allege intentional discrimination based on protected-class membership or intentional differential treatment of similarly situated inmates without a rational relationship to a legitimate state purpose.
5. Alleged violations of Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations or prison policies do not, standing alone, support a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because § 1983 provides a remedy for deprivation of federally protected rights.
6. Further leave to amend was not warranted because Plaintiff had received the relevant pleading standards and multiple opportunities to amend but remained unable to cure the deficiencies.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Detailed factual allegations are not required, but “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.”” (at 1)

“Supervisors may be held liable only if they “participated in or directed the violations, or knew of the violations and failed to act to prevent them.”” (at 5)

“Objectively, extreme deprivations are required to make out a conditions-of-confinement claim and only those deprivations denying the minimal civilized measure of life’s necessities are sufficiently grave to form the basis of an Eighth Amendment violation.” (at 6)

“Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim upon which relief may be granted.” (at 8)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Richard George, a California state prisoner housed at California State Prison in Corcoran, alleged that he had previously been housed at the Substance Abuse Treatment Facility and exposed to deteriorating buildings, outdated fire sprinklers, fire hazards, asbestos, inadequate ventilation, mold, algae, and mildew. He named the facility warden, Theresa Cisneros, and the Secretary of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Kathleen Allison, alleging Eighth Amendment, equal-protection, and state-regulation violations. He sought compensatory and punitive damages.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. After multiple opportunities to amend, Plaintiff filed a second amended complaint alleging unconstitutional prison conditions, supervisory liability, equal-protection violations, and violations of California prison regulations. The magistrate judge screened the second amended complaint and recommended dismissal without further leave to amend; the recommendation was subject to objections and review by the assigned United States district judge.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was ordered. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal for failure to state a cognizable claim, subject to objections within fourteen days and review by the assigned district judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

CASES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 676–78 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555–57 (2007)
- Doe I v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 572 F.3d 677, 681 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Moss v. U.S. Secret Service, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Simmons v. Navajo County, Ariz., 609 F.3d 1011, 1020–21 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Ewing v. City of Stockton, 588 F.3d 1218, 1235 (9th Cir. 2009)

- Jones v. Williams, 297 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Taylor v. List, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Starr v. Baca, 652 F.3d 1202, 1205–06 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Corales v. Bennett, 567 F.3d 554, 570 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Redman v. County of San Diego, 942 F.2d 1435, 1446 (9th Cir. 1991)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 834–37 (1994)
- Morgan v. Morgensen, 465 F.3d 1041, 1045 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Johnson v. Lewis, 217 F.3d 726, 731 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Labatad v. Corrections Corp. of America, 714 F.3d 1155, 1160 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Gibson v. County of Washoe, 290 F.3d 1175, 1187 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Anderson v. County of Kern, 45 F.3d 1310, 1313 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Hudson v. McMillian, 503 U.S. 1, 9 (1992)
- Wilson v. Seiter, 501 U.S. 294, 298 (1991)
- Howard v. Adkison, 887 F.2d 134, 137 (8th Cir. 1989)
- City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, 473 U.S. 432, 439 (1985)
- Shakur v. Schriro, 514 F.3d 878, 891 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Community Concerning Community Improvement v. City of Modesto, 583 F.3d 690, 702–03 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Serrano v. Francis, 345 F.3d 1071, 1082 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Engquist v. Oregon Department of Agriculture, 553 U.S. 591, 601–02 (2008)
- Village of Willowbrook v. Olech, 528 U.S. 562, 564 (2000)
- Lazy Y Ranch Ltd. v. Behrens, 546 F.3d 580, 592 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Nible v. Fink, 828 F. App'x 463 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Nurre v. Whitehead, 580 F.3d 1087, 1092 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Prock v. Warden, No. 1:13-cv-01572-MJS (PC), 2013 WL 5553349, at *11–12 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2013)
- Parra v. Hernandez, No. 08cv0191-H (CAB), 2009 WL 3818376, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2009)
- Chappell v. Newbarth, No. 1:06-cv-01378-OWW-WMW (PC), 2009 WL 1211372, at *9 (E.D. Cal. May 1, 2009)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838–39 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
 CALIFORNIA 10 11 RICHARD GEORGE, Case No.: 1:21-cv-00319-KES- BAM (PC) 12
 Plaintiff, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION TO DISMISS ACTION FOR FAILURE TO
 13 v. STATE A CLAIM 14 CISNEROS, et al., (ECF No. 26) 15 Defendants. FOURTEEN (14)

DAY DEADLINE 16 17 Plaintiff Richard George (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma 18 pauperis in this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

This case was recently reassigned to 19 the undersigned. Defendants filed a Request for Screening of the Second Amended Complaint on 20 October 7, 2025. (ECF No. 27.) Plaintiff’s second amended complaint is currently before the 21 Court for screening. (ECF No. 26.) 22 I. Screening Requirement and Standard 23 The Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a 24 governmental entity and/or against an officer or employee of a governmental entity.

28 U.S.C. 25 § 1915A(a). Plaintiff’s complaint, or any portion thereof, is subject to dismissal if it is frivolous 26 or malicious, if it fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or if it seeks monetary 27 relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b). 28 A complaint must contain “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the 1 pleader is entitled to relief....” Fed.

R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Detailed factual allegations are not 2 required, but “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere 3 conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citing *Bell 4 Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). While a plaintiff’s allegations are taken as 5 true, courts “are not required to indulge unwarranted inferences.” *Doe I v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 6 572 F.3d 677, 681 (9th Cir.

2009) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). 7 To survive screening, Plaintiff’s claims must be facially plausible, which requires 8 sufficient factual detail to allow the Court to reasonably infer that each named defendant is liable 9 for the misconduct alleged. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quotation marks omitted); *Moss v. U.S. Secret 10 Serv.*, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir.

2009). The sheer possibility that a defendant acted unlawfully 11 is not sufficient, and mere consistency with liability falls short of satisfying the plausibility 12 standard. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quotation marks omitted); *Moss*, 572 F.3d at 969. 13 II. Plaintiff’s Allegations 14 Plaintiff is currently housed at California State Prison, in Corcoran, California.

Plaintiff 15 alleges the events in the complaint occurred while Plaintiff was housed at California Substance 16 Abuse Treatment Facility (“SATF”). Plaintiff names as defendants: (1) Theresa Cisneros, 17 Warden, (2) Kathleen Allison, Secretary of California Department of Corrections and 18 Rehabilitation. Plaintiff alleges as follows. 19 In claim 1, Plaintiff alleges inadequate housing and living conditions in violation of the 20 Eighth Amendment.

As early as October 30, 2019, defendant Cisneros violated Plaintiff’s right to 21 receive safe adequate housing and living conditions by exposing Plaintiff to toxic dangerous 22 conditions like physical building deterioration; outdated fire sprinkler system; fire hazard; 23 exposure to asbestos in the dining hall and housing unit; inadequate ventilation; mold, algae.

24 Defendant's actions and inaction violated prison department of operations manual ("DOM") 25 policies. Plaintiff was denied the equal protection of law at SATF that constitutes deprivation of 26 his constitutional rights. Defendants have a duty to provide humane conditions of confinement 27 for Plaintiff and ensure that he receives adequate shelter and reasonable measures for safety.

28 Plaintiff alleges the presence of severe treatment of confinement at SATF is cruel and unusual 1 punishment. Both defendants knew of the inhumane conditions of confinement but disregarded 2 the excessive risk to Plaintiff's health and safety. 3 They were both aware of the fact from which an inference could be drawn that a risk of 4 serious harm existed.

The deprivation was objectively serious based on the failure to prevent 5 harm and the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain. 6 Warden Theresa Cisneros is responsible for the proper management of SATF on October 7 30, 2019 and the conduct of her staff. She is accountable in her position of responsibility and 8 knew or should have known of the misconduct of Plaintiff's severe treatment of confinement and 9 yet failed to prevent harm.

Defendant Cisneros is the chief executive officer responsible the 10 custody, treatment, and discipline of all incarcerated persons under her charge in October 2019. 11 Defendant Kathleen Allison, Secretary of the CDCR, is liable in her capacity for being 12 responsible for her subordinate Theresa Cisneros (Warden) and had a sufficiently culpable state 13 of mind that was deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's health.

If detention officials did not have to 14 give reasons for their actions in punishing Plaintiff with physical building deterioration of the 15 facility, outdated fire sprinkler systems, fire hazards, exposure to asbestos in the dining hall and 16 housing unit, inadequate ventilation, and mold, algae and mildew, they could act in an 17 unconstitutional manner from the court's review.

18 Plaintiff alleges he has been exposed to toxic dangerous living conditions. Plaintiff seeks 19 damages for being forced to live in conditions that violated the Constitution. Plaintiff seeks 20 compensatory and punitive damages. 21 As remedies, Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages. 22 III. Discussion 23 Plaintiff's complaint fails to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8, and fails to 24 state a cognizable claim for relief, except as provided below.

25 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 26 Pursuant to Rule 8, a complaint must contain "a short and plain statement of the claim 27 showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Detailed factual allegations 28 are not required, but "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere 1 conclusory statements, do not suffice." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citation omitted).

Plaintiff must 2 set forth "sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on 3 its face.'" *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). While factual allegations 4 are accepted as true, legal conclusions are not. *Id.*; see also *Twombly*, 550

U.S. at 556–57; Moss, 572 F.3d at 969. 6 Plaintiff’s complaint is relatively short, but it is not a plain statement of his claims.

While 7 it identifies the specific claims, the allegations are conclusory as to what happened and who was 8 involved. Plaintiff has been unable to cure this deficiency. 9 Supervisor Liability 10 Insofar as Plaintiff is attempting to sue the Warden or Secretary, or any other defendant, 11 based solely upon supervisory role, he may not do so. Liability may not be imposed on 12 supervisory personnel for the actions or omissions of their subordinates under the theory of 13 respondeat superior.

Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 676–77; Simmons v. Navajo Cty., Ariz., 609 F.3d 1011, 14 1020–21 (9th Cir. 2010); Ewing v. City of Stockton, 588 F.3d 1218, 1235 (9th Cir. 2009); Jones v. 15 Williams, 297 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 2002). 16 Supervisors may be held liable only if they “participated in or directed the violations, or 17 knew of the violations and failed to act to prevent them.” Taylor v. List, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 18 (9th Cir.

1989); accord Starr v. Baca, 652 F.3d 1202, 1205–06 (9th Cir. 2011); Corales v. 19 Bennett, 567 F.3d 554, 570 (9th Cir. 2009). “The requisite causal connection may be established 20 when an official sets in motion a ‘series of acts by others which the actor knows or reasonably 21 should know would cause others to inflict’ constitutional harms.” Corales v. Bennett, 567 F.3d at 22 570.

Supervisory liability may also exist without any personal participation if the official 23 implemented “a policy so deficient that the policy itself is a repudiation of the constitutional 24 rights and is the moving force of the constitutional violation.” Redman v. Cty. of San Diego, 942 25 F.2d 1435, 1446 (9th Cir. 1991) (citations and quotations marks omitted), abrogated on other 26 grounds by Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825 (1970).

When a defendant holds a supervisory 27 position, the causal link between such defendant and the claimed constitutional violation must be 28 specifically alleged. See Fayle v. Stapley, 607 F.2d 858, 862 (9th Cir. 1979); Mosher v. Saalfeld, 1 589 F.2d 438, 441 (9th Cir. 1978). Vague and conclusory allegations concerning the involvement 2 of supervisory personnel in civil rights violations are not sufficient.

See Ivey v. Board of Regents, 3 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982). 4 Plaintiff does not allege that Defendants were personally involved in any constitutional 5 deprivation. Further, Plaintiff fails to identify any policy which is so deficient that the policy 6 itself is a repudiation of the constitutional rights and is the moving force of the constitutional 7 violation.

8 Eight Amendment – Conditions of Confinement 9 The Eighth Amendment protects prisoners from inhumane methods of punishment and 10 from inhumane conditions of confinement. Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825 (1994); Morgan v. 11 Morgensen, 465 F.3d 1041, 1045 (9th Cir. 2006).

Thus, no matter where they are housed, prison officials have a duty to ensure that prisoners are provided adequate shelter, food, clothing, sanitation, medical care, and personal safety. *Johnson v. Lewis*, 217 F.3d 726, 731 (9th Cir. 14 2000) (quotation marks and citations omitted).

To establish a violation of the Eighth Amendment, the prisoner must “show that the officials acted with deliberate indifference...” 16 *Labatad v. Corrs. Corp. of Amer.*, 714 F.3d 1155, 1160 (9th Cir. 2013) (citing *Gibson v. Cty. of Washoe*, 290 F.3d 1175, 1187 (9th Cir. 2002)). 18 The deliberate indifference standard involves both an objective and a subjective prong.

19 First, the alleged deprivation must be, in objective terms, “sufficiently serious.” *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834. Second, subjectively, the prison official must “know of and disregard an excessive 21 risk to inmate health or safety.” *Id.* at 837; *Anderson v. Cty. of Kern*, 45 F.3d 1310, 1313 (9th Cir. 1995).

The circumstances, nature, and duration of the deprivations are critical in determining 23 whether the conditions complained of are grave enough to form the basis of a viable Eighth Amendment claim. *Johnson v. Lewis*, 217 F.3d 726, 731 (9th Cir. 2006). Mere negligence on the 25 part of a prison official is not sufficient to establish liability, but rather, the official's conduct must 26 have been wanton.

Farmer, 511 U.S. at 835; *Frost v. Agnos*, 152 F.3d 1124, 1128 (9th Cir. 1998). 27 Objectively, extreme deprivations are required to make out a conditions-of-confinement 28 claim and only those deprivations denying the minimal civilized measure of life's necessities are 1 sufficiently grave to form the basis of an Eighth Amendment violation. *Hudson v. McMillian*, 2 503 U.S. 1, 9 (1992).

Although the Constitution ““does not mandate comfortable prisons,”” 3 *Wilson v. Seiter*, 501 U.S. 294, 298 (1991), “inmates are entitled to reasonably adequate 4 sanitation, personal hygiene, and laundry privileges, particularly over a lengthy course of time,” 5 *Howard v. Adkison*, 887 F.2d 134, 137 (8th Cir. 1989). 6 Here, Plaintiff alleges that the institution has unconstitutional conditions of confinement 7 consisting of asbestos, mold, algae and mildew in the showers, deteriorating fire sprinklers, 8 inadequate ventilation, among other things.

However, Plaintiff's complaint does not include 9 details to support these allegations. He does not describe what makes him believe that these 10 conditions exist at the institution such as what he saw or what any person at the institution said. 11 He does not allege that he has seen any tests or reports of these conditions. He does not allege that 12 any professional has reported on these conditions.

He does not describe whether these conditions 13 were located at the institution. 14 Plaintiff's vague description that he was exposed to these conditions is not sufficient to 15 state a claim for violation of his constitutional rights.

The Court cannot determine the 16 circumstances, nature, and duration of the alleged conditions. Nor can the Court determine if they 17 are objectively, sufficiently serious to support a constitutional claim. 18 Additionally, Plaintiff does not plead facts that would establish that any named defendant 19 is liable for these conditions because they knew of and disregard an excessive risk to inmate 20 health or safety.

Plaintiff does not connect any of the named defendants to his allegations. 21 He also does not allege that any of these defendants acted with deliberate indifference to 22 the conditions he describes. The complaint does not plead any facts showing that any defendant 23 knew of the black mold, asbestos, or other toxic substances to which Plaintiff was allegedly 24 exposed; that any defendant knew that such exposure posed an excessive risk to Plaintiff's health 25 and safety; and that any defendant deliberately disregarded such risk.

Plaintiff's conclusory 26 allegations that they "knew" or "should have known" are insufficient. For this reason, Plaintiff 27 has not pled sufficient facts in support of the subjective component of his Eighth Amendment 28 claim. 1 Equal Protection 2 The Equal Protection Clause requires that persons who are similarly situated be treated 3 alike. *City of Cleburne, Tex. v. Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432, 439, (1985); *Shakur v. 4 Schriro*, 514 F.3d 878, 891 (9th Cir.

2008). An equal protection claim may be established by 5 showing that defendants intentionally discriminated against a plaintiff based on his membership 6 in a protected class, *Comm. Concerning Cmty. Improvement v. City of Modesto*, 583 F.3d 690, 7 702–03 (9th Cir. 2009); *Serrano v. Francis*, 345 F.3d 1071,1082 (9th Cir. 2003), or that similarly 8 situated individuals were intentionally treated differently without a rational relationship to a 9 legitimate state purpose, *Engquist v. Oregon Dep't of Agr.*, 553 U.S. 591, 601–02 (2008); *Village 10 of Willowbrook v. Olech*, 528 U.S. 562, 564 (2000); *Lazy Y Ranch Ltd. v. Behrens*, 546 F.3d 580, 11 592 (9th Cir.

2008). 12 The Court finds that Plaintiff has not stated a cognizable equal protection claim. Plaintiff 13 does not allege that he was discriminated against because of his membership in any protected 14 class. He also does not allege that he was intentionally treated differently than other similarly 15 situated inmates without a rational relationship to a legitimate state purpose.

16 Title 15 Claim 17 To the extent that Defendant has not complied with applicable state statutes or prison 18 regulations, these deprivations do not support a claim under § 1983. Section 1983 only provides a 19 cause of action for the deprivation of federally protected rights. See, e.g., *Nible v. Fink*, 828 Fed. 20 Appx. 463 (9th Cir. 2020) (violations of Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations do not 21 create private right of action); *Nurre v. Whitehead*, 580 F.3d 1087, 1092 (9th Cir.

2009) (section 22 1983 claims must be premised on violation of federal constitutional right); *Prock v. Warden*, No. 23 1:13-cv-01572-MJS (PC), 2013 WL 5553349, at *11–12 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 8,

2013) (noting that 24 several district courts have found no implied private right of action under title 15 and stating that 25 “no § 1983 claim arises for [violations of title 15] even if they occurred.”); Parra v. Hernandez, 26 No. 08cv0191-H (CAB), 2009 WL 3818376, at *3 (S.D.

Cal. Nov. 13, 2009) (granting motion to 27 dismiss prisoner's claims brought pursuant to Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations); 28 Chappell v. Newbarth, No. 1:06-cv-01378-OWW-WMW (PC), 2009 WL 1211372, at *9 (E.D. 1 Cal. May 1, 2009) (holding that there is no private right of action under Title 15 of the California 2 Code of Regulations). 3 IV. Conclusion and Order 4 For the reasons discussed, the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to state a cognizable 5 claim for relief.

Despite being provided with the relevant pleading and legal standards, and given 6 multiple opportunities to amend, Plaintiff has been unable to cure the deficiencies in his second 7 amended complaint. Further leave to amend is not warranted. Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 8 1130 (9th Cir. 2000). 9 Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this 10 action be dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim upon which relief may be granted.

11 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District 12 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 13 fourteen (14) days after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, the parties may 14 file written objections with the court.

The document should be captioned “Objections to 15 Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Objections, if any, shall not exceed 16 fifteen (15) pages or include exhibits. Exhibits may be referenced by document and page 17 number if already in the record before the Court. Any pages filed in excess of the 15-page 18 limit may not be considered.

The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the 19 specified time may result in the waiver of the “right to challenge the magistrate’s factual 20 findings” on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838–39 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing Baxter 21 v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)). 22 IT IS SO ORDERED. 23 24 Dated: October 9, 2025 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
_ UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 25 26 27 28