

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION**

In re CIM-SQ Transfer Cases

No. 5:20-cv-06326-EJD; related case 24-cv-03082-EJD, United States District Court for the Northern District of
California, San Jose Division (March 21, 2025)

OPINION

IN RE CIM-SQ TRANSFER CASES

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 SAN JOSE DIVISION

7 8 9 IN RE CIM-SQ TRANSFER CASES Case No. 5:20-cv-06326-EJD 10

ORDER OF SERVICE

This Document Relates To: 11 24-cv-03082-EJD; Ortiz v. Diaz 12 13

14 INTRODUCTION

15 Plaintiff, a California prisoner, filed a pro se civil rights action in state court. Plaintiff 16
alleged that defendants violated his constitutional rights by transferring over 100 inmates, some of
17 whom were infected with COVID-19, from the California Institution for Men (CIM) to San 18
Quentin State Prison (SQSP)1 in May 2020. Dkt. No. 1 at 2-3. The case is now before the Court
19 for screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), and service of the complaint on defendants is
20 ordered. Plaintiff will be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis by separate order. 21 This
case has been consolidated with cases in this district related to the 2020 prisoner 22 transfer and
related to the first case filed, No. 5:20-cv-06326-EJD, which now has the caption “In 23 Re CIM-
SQ Transfer Cases.” Pro se prisoner cases that are part of the consolidated matter are 24 stayed
except for the purposes of service. Service shall therefore proceed in plaintiff’s case as 25 ordered
below, but the case will remain stayed for all other purposes. The docket for Case No. 24- 26 cv-
03082-EJD and all other individual dockets have been closed. If plaintiff wishes to file any 27 1
motions, he must file them in Case No. 5:20-cv-06326-EJD and include his original case number,
2 No. 24-cv-03082-EJD, on the left side of the heading.

3 STANDARD OF REVIEW

4 Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which prisoners seek 5 redress
from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 6
1915A(a). The Court must identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of 7
the complaint, if the complaint “is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief
8 may be granted,” or “seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.”

Id. 9 § 1915A(b). Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed. *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). 11 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” “Specific facts are not necessary; the 12 statement need only give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon 13 which it rests.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 127 S. Ct. 2197, 2200 (2007) (citations omitted). Although to 14 state a claim a complaint “does not need detailed factual allegations, . . . a plaintiff’s obligation to 15 provide the grounds of his entitle[ment] to relief requires more than labels and conclusions, and a 16 formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do Factual allegations must 17 be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 18 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1964-65 (2007) (citations omitted). A complaint must proffer “enough facts to 19 state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* at 1974. 20 To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two elements: (1) that a 21 right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged 22 violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 23 42, 48 (1988). 24 If a court dismisses a complaint for failure to state a claim, it should “freely give 25 leave” to amend “when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). A court has discretion to 26 deny leave to amend due to “undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive on the part of the movant, 27 repeated failure to cure deficiencies by amendment previously allowed, undue prejudice to the 1 opposing party by virtue of allowance of the amendment, [and] futility of amendment.” 2 *Leadsinger, Inc. v. BMG Music Pub.*, 512 F.3d 522, 532 (9th Cir. 2008).

3 LEGAL CLAIMS

4 Plaintiff names the following defendants: 5 1. CDCR Acting Secretary Ralph Diaz 6 2. San Quentin Warden Ron Davis 7 3. Ronald Broomfield, Acting Warden of SQSP 8 4. A. Pachynski, Chief Medical Officer of SQSP 9 5. Dean Borders, CIM Warden 10 Dkt. No. 1 at 2. Plaintiff alleges: 11 On May 30, 2020 CDCR knowingly transferred 122 inmates from CIM, a prison with 509 COVID-19 positive case and 10 deaths, to San Quentin, a 12 prison with 0 case. CDCR did not quarantine or test these 122 inmate for COVID-19. Upon arrival of these 122 inmates to San Quentin, staff 13 ignored the transfer procedures and housed these inmates with other inmates at San Quentin in all housing units, imbedding positive inmate 14 with San Quentin’s population that had 0 case of COVID-19. San Quentin staff moved symptomatic inmates around the cell blocks and 15 systematically infecting 1,457 inmates in just 29 days.

16 *Id.* at 2-3. Plaintiff seeks compensatory and punitive damages. *Id.* at 3.

17 Liberally construed, plaintiff’s allegations state a plausible claim for deliberate 18 indifference to plaintiff’s safety, in violation of the Eighth Amendment, against the named 19 defendants in their individual capacities. *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994).

20 CONCLUSION

21 1. The Court orders that service on the following defendants shall proceed under the 22

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's ("CDCR") e-service program for civil rights cases from prisoners in the CDCR's custody: 24 1. CDCR Acting Secretary Ralph Diaz 25 2. San Quentin Warden Ron Davis 26 3. Ronald Broomfield, Acting Warden of SQSP 27 4. A. Pachynski, Chief Medical Officer of SQSP 1 In accordance with the program, the clerk is directed to serve on the CDCR via email the 2 following documents: the operative complaint (Dkt. No. 6), this Order of Service, a CDCR Report 3 of E-Service Waiver form, and a summons. The clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on the 4 plaintiff. 5 No later than 40 days after service of this order via email on the CDCR, the CDCR shall 6 provide the court a completed CDCR Report of E-Service Waiver advising the court which 7 defendant(s) listed in this order will be waiving service of process without the need for service by 8 the USMS and which defendant(s) decline to waive service or could not be reached. The CDCR 9 also shall provide a copy of the CDCR Report of E-Service Waiver to the California Attorney 10 General's Office which, within 21 days, shall file with the Court a waiver of service of process for 11 the defendant(s) who are waiving service. 12 Upon receipt of the CDCR Report of E-Service Waiver, the clerk shall prepare for each 13 defendant who has not waived service according to the CDCR Report of E-Service Waiver a 14 USM-285 Form. The clerk shall provide to the USMS the completed USM-285 forms and copies 15 of this order, the summons and the operative complaint for service upon each defendant who has 16 not waived service. The clerk also shall provide to the USMS a copy of the CDCR Report of E- 17 Service Waiver. 18 6. All defendants are cautioned that Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 19 requires them to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint. 20 Pursuant to Rule 4, if defendants, after being notified of this action and asked by the Court, on 21 behalf of plaintiff, to waive service of the summons, fail to do so, they will be required to bear the 22 cost of such service unless good cause can be shown for their failure to sign and return the waiver 23 form. 24 7. All communications by plaintiff with the Court must be served on defendants' 25 counsel by mailing a true copy of the document to defendants' counsel. The Court may disregard 26 any document which a party files but fails to send a copy of to his opponent. Until defendants' 27 counsel has been designated, plaintiff may mail a true copy of the document directly to] counsel rather than directly to defendants. 2 8. Plaintiff is responsible for prosecuting this case. Plaintiff must promptly keep the 3 Court informed of any change of address and must comply with the Court's orders in a timely 4 || fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant 5 || to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). Plaintiff must file a notice of change of address in every 6 || pending case every time he is moved to a new facility. 7 9. Any motion for an extension of time must be filed no later than the deadline sought 8 || to be extended and must be accompanied by a showing of good cause. Plaintiff is cautioned that 9 || he must include the case name and case number for this case on any document he submits to the 10 || Court for consideration in this case. 11 10. The case will remain stayed for all purposes other than service of the complaint on 12 || defendants. 13 IT IS SO ORDERED.) Dated: March 21, 2025 az QO

2 EDWARD J. DAVILA

= 16 United States District Judge Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ca/2025/in-re-cim-sq-transfer-cases-h43idpmr>