

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

Martinez v. Gamboa

No. 21-cv-02744-EMC (N.D. Cal. Mar. 9, 2023) · No. 21-cv-02744-EMC · Decided March 9, 2023

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California screened Ronald F. Martinez’s First Amended Complaint alleging deliberate indifference to a serious medical need under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court dismissed the claims against Drs. Gordon, Hrobko, Hack, and Bright, but found a cognizable Eighth Amendment claim against Dr. Gamboa based on alleged delays and interference concerning a biopsy of a lesion later diagnosed as squamous cell carcinoma. The court also resolved several motions and established a briefing schedule for dispositive motions.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Northern District of California                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Edward M. Chen                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Northern District of California                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| DECIDED               | March 9, 2023                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| DOCKET                | 21-cv-02744-EMC                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Pro se prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983; the court screened the First Amended Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and resolved several motions.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must identify cognizable claims and dismiss claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. Pro se pleadings are liberally construed. To state an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim, the plaintiff must allege an objectively serious medical need and subjective deliberate indifference. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- cruel and unusual punishment
- pleadings
- summary judgment

## PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner medical care

constitutional law

civil procedure

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the First Amended Complaint stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against the individual medical defendants.
2. Whether the allegations against Dr. Gamboa were sufficient to survive screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
3. Whether the court had jurisdiction to order Corcoran State Prison to return property allegedly confiscated from Martinez.

## HOLDINGS

1. The First Amended Complaint failed to state an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Drs. Gordon and Hrobko because both independently diagnosed the lesions as seborrheic keratoses and provided treatment that resolved one lesion and partially resolved the other; their conduct did not amount to deliberate indifference.
2. The First Amended Complaint failed to state a claim against Dr. Hack because Dr. Hack provided the biopsy referral Martinez sought, and the alleged failure to complete the biopsy was attributed to Dr. Gamboa.
3. The First Amended Complaint failed to state a claim against Dr. Bright because no facts suggested that Dr. Bright saw or denied a biopsy request; his alleged involvement was limited to denying Dr. Gamboa's request for a third cryotherapy treatment.
4. The First Amended Complaint stated a cognizable Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Dr. Gamboa.
5. The court could not order Corcoran State Prison to return the property because it lacked jurisdiction to grant that relief; Corcoran State Prison and Martinez's current institution were outside the relevant district.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“Mr. Martinez has stated a claim against Dr. Gamboa for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need.”*  
(at 8)

*“To establish an Eighth Amendment claim on a condition of confinement, such as an excessive risk to health or safety, a prisoner-plaintiff must show: (1) an objectively, sufficiently serious, deprivation, and (2) that the official was, subjectively, deliberately indifferent to the inmate’s health or safety.”* (at 6)

*“If believed, these allegations suggest that Dr. Gamboa was deliberately indifferent to Mr. Martinez’s serious medical need for a biopsy.”* (at 8)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Martinez, a state prisoner, developed a lesion on his nose and repeatedly sought medical care, noting a family history of skin cancer. Two dermatologists diagnosed the lesions as seborrheic keratoses and treated them with cryotherapy; after the lesion persisted, Dr. Hack requested a biopsy, but Martinez alleges that Dr. Gamboa substituted a request for additional cryotherapy and concealed that substitution. After Martinez was transferred to another prison, a dermatologist ordered a biopsy, which revealed squamous cell carcinoma, and the lesion was removed.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Martinez initially alleged deliberate indifference to a serious medical need. After screening the original complaint, the court found that the allegations, liberally construed, stated a cognizable claim and permitted amendment. On screening the First Amended Complaint, the court dismissed the claims against Drs. Gordon, Hrobko, Hack, and Bright, allowed the deliberate-indifference claim against Dr. Gamboa to proceed, granted or denied the listed motions as specified, and established a dispositive-motion briefing schedule.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Department*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990)
- *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988)
- *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 832, 834, 837 (1994)
- *Jett v. Penner*, 439 F.3d 1091, 1096 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1060 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *McGuckin v. Smith*, 974 F.2d 1050, 1059 (9th Cir. 1992)
- *WMX Technologies, Inc. v. Miller*, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc)
- *O’Loughlin v. Doe*, 920 F.2d 614, 617 (9th Cir. 1990)
- *Franklin v. Oregon*, 662 F.2d 1337, 1344 (9th Cir. 1981)
- *Woods v. Carey*, 684 F.3d 934, 939 (9th Cir. 2012)
- *Rand v. Rowland*, 154 F.3d 952, 962-63 (9th Cir. 1998)

## OPINION

Martinez v. Gamboa

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 RONALD F. MARTINEZ, Case No. 21-cv-02744-EMC 8 Plaintiff, ORDER DISMISSING

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT IN PART;

9 v. RESOLVING MOTIONS; AND

ESTABLISHING BRIEFING

10 L. GAMBOA, et al., SCHEDULE 11 Defendants. Docket Nos. 69, 71, 73, 75, 78, 89 12 13

#### 14 I. INTRODUCTION

15 Ronald F. Martinez, a prisoner at High Desert State Prison, filed this pro se civil rights 16  
action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging deliberate indifference to a serious medical need by 17  
officials at Salinas Valley State Prison (“SVSP”). See Docket No. 1 (“Complaint”). The Court 18  
screened the Complaint and concluded that, while its allegations “[lay] close to the line of medical  
19 negligence,” when the allegations were liberally construed Mr. Martinez had sufficiently  
alleged a 20 deliberate indifference claim. See Docket No. 16 at 5-6. The Court ordered  
Defendants to 21 respond to the Complaint. See generally, *id.* 22 Mr. Martinez subsequently  
sought, and was granted, leave to amend his allegations. See 23 Docket Nos. 45, 51. Mr.  
Martinez’s First Amended Complaint is now before the Court for 24 screening. See Docket No.  
70. 25 For the reasons stated below, the Court concludes that the FAC states a cognizable claim 26  
against Defendant Gamboa, who shall respond to the FAC. The FAC fails to state a claim as to all  
27 other Defendants, and they are dismissed.

#### 1 II. BACKGROUND

2 Mr. Martinez sues the following individuals: Dr. Gamboa, Mr. Martinez’s primary care 3  
physician at SVSP; Dr. Hack, a physician at SVSP; Dr. Bright, the Chief Physician and Surgeon at  
4 SVSP; and Drs. Gordon and Hrobko, dermatologists who treated Mr. Martinez. See FAC at 2. 5  
Mr. Martinez alleges the following in the FAC: 6 In June 2016, Mr. Martinez noticed a lesion on  
his left nostril. See *id.* at 4. He submitted 7 health requests regarding this lesion. See *id.* at 5. 8 On  
January 9, 2017, Mr. Martinez met with Dr. Gordon, a dermatologist, via Telemed, a 9 system that  
allows for remote video consultations. See *id.* at 5. Mr. Martinez informed Dr. 10 Gordon that Mr.  
Martinez’s family had a history of skin cancer. See *id.* Dr. Gordon diagnosed the 11 lesion as a  
seborrheic keratosis, which he informed Mr. Martinez was a sort of rash. See *id.* at 6. 12 Mr.  
Martinez challenged Dr. Gordon and asked how he could be sure of a diagnosis made through 13 a  
video consultation. See *id.* at 7. Dr. Gordon adhered to his initial diagnosis. See *id.* Mr. 14  
Martinez asked for a second opinion and was told Dr. Gordon was the only available 15  
dermatologist at that time. See *id.* 16 On or around this same date, Mr. Martinez had a medical  
appointment with non-defendant 17 Dr. Abraham. See *id.* at 8. Mr. Martinez informed Dr.  
Abraham that Mr. Martinez’s family had a 18 history of skin cancer. See *id.* In the FAC, Mr.  
Martinez represents that Dr. Abraham requested a 19 biopsy for Mr. Martinez, and that this was  
approved by Dr. Gamboa. See *id.* However, the 20 exhibits Mr. Martinez provided with the FAC,  
and to which he refers, see *id.*, show that this was 21 not so. Rather, Dr. Abraham “request[ed] a  
dermatology consult for biopsy/ treatment” of a lesion 22 on Mr. Martinez’s “left temple.” FAC,  
Ex. A at 28.1 Thus, Dr. Gamboa did not approve a biopsy, 23 but rather a referral to a

dermatologist for further evaluation. Mr. Martinez's exhibits show that 24 Mr. Martinez received the consultation requested by Dr. Abraham and approved by Dr. Gamboa. 25 See id. at 29. 26 On February 14, 2017, Mr. Martinez received cryotherapy from Dr. Gordon for the lesions 27 1 on his nose and on his left temple. See FAC at 9. Although Mr. Martinez raised the subject of a 2 biopsy in that appointment, he confirmed to Dr. Gordon that he wished to receive cryotherapy. 3 See id. Mr. Martinez represents that his nose lesion was non-responsive to, and did not heal well 4 after, the cryotherapy. See id. at 10. However, the exhibits provided by Mr. Martinez show that 5 the temple lesion entirely resolved after cryotherapy, and the nose lesion partially resolved. See 6 FAC, Ex. A at 31. 7 On February 28, 2017, Mr. Martinez saw Dr. Gamboa for a follow-up appointment. See 8 FAC at 11. Mr. Martinez pointed out to Dr. Gamboa that the nose lesion was not entirely 9 resolved. See id. Dr. Gamboa explained that sometimes two cryotherapy sessions are necessary to 10 be effective, and Mr. Martinez agreed that this was true. See id. Mr. Martinez "reminded" Dr. 11 Gamboa that Mr. Martinez's family had a history of skin cancer. Id. Mr. Martinez requested a 12 biopsy of the nose lesion. See id. at 12. Dr. Gamboa said that he would review Mr. Martinez's 13 file to determine whether a biopsy was indicated and advised Mr. Martinez to cover his nose with 14 zinc oxide before any sun exposure. See id. 15 On June 11, 2017, Mr. Martinez had a Telemed appointment with a new dermatologist, Dr. 16 Hrobko. See id. at 13. Dr. Hrobko reached the same diagnosis as Dr. Gordon – that the lesion was 17 a seborrheic keratosis – and advised that it be frozen off with liquid nitrogen. See id. at 14. 18 Between June 23 and June 30, 2017, Mr. Martinez received a second cryotherapy 19 procedure, this time from Dr. Gamboa. See id. at 16. Dr. Gamboa told Mr. Martinez that if this 20 second cryotherapy procedure did not work, then he would "review a different course of treatment, 21 a biopsy." Id. at 17. Mr. Martinez represents that the second cryotherapy procedure did not 22 resolve the lesion on his nose. See id. at 18. On July 23, 2017, Mr. Martinez submitted a request 23 for a biopsy. See id. 24 On August 8, 2017, Mr. Martinez had an appointment with Dr. Hack. See id. Dr. Hack 25 noted that Mr. Martinez's nose still bore a lesion of 3mm x 4mm, see FAC, Ex. A at 37, and 26 ordered a biopsy, see FAC at 19. 27 Mr. Martinez alleges that Dr. Gamboa reviewed Dr. Hack's request and "intentionally and 1 for a third cryotherapy procedure. Id. at 19. On August 18, 2017, Dr. Bright denied this request. 2 See id. at 20. Mr. Martinez argues that Dr. Bright should have ordered a biopsy rather than merely 3 dismissing the request for a third cryotherapy procedure. See id. 4 On or about August 30, 2017, during a medical appointment, Mr. Martinez asked Dr. 5 Gamboa the status of the biopsy requested by Dr. Hack. See id. Dr. Gamboa stated that the 6 request had been denied, and "conceal[ed]" from Mr. Martinez that Dr. Gamboa had "substituted . 7 . . his own" request for a third cryotherapy procedure in place of Dr. Hack's request for a biopsy. 8 Id. Dr. Gamboa led Mr. Martinez to believe that the request for a biopsy, rather than the request 9 for a third cryotherapy procedure, had been denied. See id. 10 Through the remaining months of 2017, and the first half of 2018, Mr. Martinez continued 11 to complain about the lesion in medical appointments, and to request a biopsy. See id. at 22. In

12 July 2018, Mr. Martinez was transferred to Corcoran State Prison. See *id.* at 20. Medical staff at  
13 that prison arranged for Mr. Martinez to meet with a dermatologist, who immediately ordered a  
14 biopsy of the lesion. See *id.* The biopsy showed that the lesion was squamous cell carcinoma.  
15 See *id.* The lesion has been removed. See *id.*

### 16 III. DISCUSSION

17 A federal court must engage in a preliminary screening of any case in which a prisoner 18 seeks  
redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. See 28 19  
U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the court must identify any cognizable claims, and dismiss any  
20 claims which are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or  
21 seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See *id.* at § 1915A(b).  
22 Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed. See *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't*, 901 F.2d  
23 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). 24 Although a complaint “does not need detailed factual allegations, .  
. . . a plaintiff’s 25 obligation to provide the ‘grounds’ of his ‘entitle[ment] to relief’ requires more  
than labels and 26 conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will  
not do. . . . 27 Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative  
level.” *Bell Atl.* 1 “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* at 570. 2  
To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two elements: (1) that a 3 right  
secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated and (2) that the 4 violation  
was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. See *West v. Atkins*, 487 5 U.S. 42,  
48 (1988). 6 The “‘treatment a prisoner receives in prison and the conditions under which he is  
confined 7 are subject to scrutiny under the Eighth Amendment.’” *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S.  
825, 832 8 (1994). To establish an Eighth Amendment claim on a condition of confinement, such  
as an 9 excessive risk to health or safety, a prisoner-plaintiff must show: (1) an objectively,  
sufficiently 10 serious, deprivation, and (2) that the official was, subjectively, deliberately  
indifferent to the 11 inmate’s health or safety. See *id.* at 834. The objective prong may be satisfied  
by the existence of 12 a serious medical need if the failure to address that need “could result in  
further significant injury 13 or the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain.” *Jett v. Penner*, 439  
F.3d 1091, 1096 (9th Cir. 14 2006) (internal quotation marks omitted). A defendant is deliberately  
indifferent if he knows that 15 an inmate faces a substantial risk of serious harm and disregards  
that risk by failing to take 16 reasonable steps to abate it. *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 837. The defendant  
must not only “be aware of 17 facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial  
risk of serious harm exists,” but 18 he “must also draw the inference.” *Id.* 19 A claim of medical  
malpractice or negligence is insufficient to make out a violation of the 20 Eighth Amendment,  
because negligence does not rise to the level of deliberate indifference. See 21 *Toguchi v. Chung*,  
391 F.3d 1051, 1060 (9th Cir. 2004); see also *McGuckin v. Smith*, 974 F.2d 22 1050, 1059 (9th  
Cir. 1992) (mere negligence in diagnosing or treating a medical condition, 23 without more, does  
not violate a prisoner’s 8th Amendment rights), overruled in part on other 24 grounds by *WMX  
Techs., Inc. v. Miller*, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc); 25 *O’Loughlin v. Doe*, 920

F.2d 614, 617 (9th Cir. 1990) (repeatedly failing to satisfy requests for 26 aspirins and antacids to alleviate headaches, nausea and pains is not constitutional violation; 27 isolated occurrences of neglect may constitute grounds for medical malpractice but do not rise to 1 a prisoner-patient and prison medical authorities regarding treatment does not give rise to a § 1983 2 claim.” Franklin v. Oregon, 662 F.2d 1337, 1344 (9th Cir. 1981). 3 Mr. Martinez’s expanded allegations in the FAC show that Drs. Gordon and Hrobko were 4 not deliberately indifferent to Mr. Martinez’s serious medical needs. The two dermatologists 5 treated Mr. Martinez in separate appointments, and each diagnosed his lesions as seborrheic 6 keratosis. See FAC at 7, 14. Contrary to Mr. Martinez’s prior representations, the cryotherapy 7 prescribed by these dermatologists was not entirely ineffective. Mr. Martinez concedes in his 8 FAC that the cryotherapy resolved the lesion on his left temple, and the medical records he 9 provides show that the cryotherapy partially resolved the lesion on his left nostril. See FAC, Ex. 10 A at 31. And as explained above, both dermatologists treated Mr. Martinez before any doctor had 11 ordered a biopsy; contrary to Mr. Martinez’s suggestions in the FAC, neither dermatologist 12 overrode a medical order that Mr. Martinez be given a biopsy. That two doctors independently 13 reached the same diagnosis and prescribed a treatment that worked in part does not suggest any 14 deliberate indifference on the part of either. Accordingly, Mr. Martinez’s claim is DISMISSED 15 as to Drs. Gordon and Hrobko. 16 Mr. Martinez’s claim fails as to Dr. Hack because, even under Mr. Martinez’s allegations, 17 Dr. Hack provided exactly what Mr. Martinez wanted: a referral to receive a biopsy. See FAC at 18 18-20. According to the FAC, the biopsy never occurred because Dr. Gamboa “substituted” his 19 request for Dr. Hack’s, and then “conceal[ed]” that substitution. See id. at 19-21. This is an 20 allegation against Dr. Gamboa and does not reveal any wrongdoing or even negligence on the part 21 of Dr. Hack. Accordingly, Mr. Martinez’s claim is DISMISSED as to Dr. Hack. 22 Similarly, Mr. Martinez’s claim fails as to Dr. Bright because there are no facts to suggest 23 Dr. Bright ever saw a request that Mr. Martinez be given a biopsy. See id. at 18-20. Mr. 24 Martinez’s allegation that Dr. Gamboa substituted a third cryotherapy request in place of Dr. 25 Hack’s biopsy request in fact suggests the opposite: that Dr. Bright did not see Dr. Hack’s request 26 for a biopsy. Thus, Dr. Bright’s only involvement in this saga was to deny Dr. Gamboa’s request 27 that Mr. Martinez be treated with cryotherapy for a third time. See id. This is a treatment which 1 Like Dr. Hack, Dr. Bright did not wrong Mr. Martinez. Accordingly, Mr. Martinez’s claim is 2 DISMISSED as to Dr. Bright. 3 Mr. Martinez has stated a claim against Dr. Gamboa for deliberate indifference to a serious 4 medical need. He alleges that Dr. Gamboa knew the lesion on Mr. Martinez’s nose had not 5 entirely resolved with cryotherapy, and that Dr. Gamboa knew of Mr. Martinez’s family history of 6 skin cancer. More significantly, Mr. Martinez alleges that Dr. Gamboa promised to consider a 7 biopsy if the second cryotherapy procedure did not work; somehow substituted a request for a 8 third cryotherapy session in place of Dr. Hack’s request for a biopsy; and concealed from his 9 patient that Dr. Hack’s biopsy request had not been reviewed by Dr. Bright. See id. at 17-20. Mr. 10 Martinez alleges that because of Dr. Gamboa’s actions, his skin cancer went untreated for three 11 years.

See *id.* at 20-22. If believed, these allegations suggest that Dr. Gamboa was deliberately indifferent to Mr. Martinez's serious medical need for a biopsy.

#### 13 IV. MOTIONS

14 Defense counsel moved for a nunc pro tunc extension of time to serve a discovery 15 response upon Mr. Martinez. See Docket No. 69. This motion is GRANTED. 16 Mr. Martinez moved for an extension of time to file his FAC, Docket No. 64, and then 17 moved to withdraw his extension request, Docket No. 71. A second extension motion was 18 received by the Court after Mr. Martinez already had filed his FAC. Docket No. 73. The first 19 extension motion shall be terminated, Docket No. 64; the withdrawal motion is GRANTED, 20 Docket No. 71; and the second extension motion is DENIED AS MOOT, Docket No. 73. 21 Both parties ask for the FAC to be screened. Docket Nos. 75, 89. The motions are 22 GRANTED. This order screens the FAC. 23 Mr. Martinez asks the Court to order Corcoran State Prison ("CSP") to return certain 24 property which was confiscated while Mr. Martinez was held in administrative segregation at CSP 25 following a rules violation. See Docket No. 78. This Court has no jurisdiction to do so, and in 26 any event, Mr. Martinez has been transferred to High Desert State Prison ("HDSP"). See Docket

27 No. 88 (noting change of address). If Mr. Martinez believes he wrongfully has been deprived of 1 HDSP lie within the Eastern District of California. See 28 U.S.C. 84(b).

#### 2 V. CONCLUSION

3 Defendant Gamboa already has been served in this action. See Docket No. 20. 4 1. In order to expedite the resolution of this case, the following briefing schedule for 5 dispositive motions is set: 6 a. No later than June 2, 2023, Defendant Gamboa must file and serve a 7 motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion. If Defendant is of the opinion that this 8 case cannot be resolved by summary judgment, Defendant must so inform the Court prior to the 9 date the motion is due. If Defendant files a motion for summary judgment, Defendant must 10 provide to Plaintiff a new Rand notice regarding summary judgment procedures at the time he 11 files such a motion. See *Woods v. Carey*, 684 F.3d 934, 939 (9th Cir. 2012). 12 b. Plaintiff's opposition to the summary judgment or other dispositive motion 13 must be filed with the Court and served upon Defendant no later than June 30, 2023. Plaintiff 14 must bear in mind the notice and warning regarding summary judgment provided later in this 15 order as he prepares his opposition to any motion for summary judgment. 16 c. Defendant shall file a reply brief no later than July 14, 2023. 17 2. Plaintiff is provided the following notices and warnings about the procedures for 18 motions for summary judgment: 19 The defendants may make a motion for summary judgment by which they seek to have your case dismissed. A motion for 20 summary judgment under Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will, if granted, end your case. . . . Rule 56 tells you what 21 you must do in order to oppose a motion for summary judgment. Generally, summary judgment must be granted when there is no 22 genuine issue of material fact -- that is, if there is no real dispute about any fact that would affect the result of your case, the party 23 who asked for summary

judgment is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, which will end your case. When a party you are suing 24 makes a motion for summary judgment that is properly supported by declarations (or other sworn testimony), you cannot simply rely on 25 what your complaint says. Instead, you must set out specific facts in declarations, depositions, answers to interrogatories, or 26 authenticated documents, as provided in Rule 56(e), that contradict the facts shown in the defendants' declarations and documents and 27 show that there is a genuine issue of material fact for trial. If you do granted, your case will be dismissed and there will be no trial. *Rand 1 v. Rowland*, 154 F.3d 952, 962-63 (9th Cir. 1998). 2 If Defendant files a motion for summary judgment for failure to exhaust administrative remedies, 3 he is seeking to have the case dismissed. As with other defense summary judgment motions, if a 4 motion for summary judgment for failure to exhaust administrative remedies is granted, Plaintiff's 5 case will be dismissed and there will be no trial. 6 3. All communications by Plaintiff with the Court must be served on defense counsel 7 by mailing a true copy of the document to defense counsel. The Court may disregard any 8 document which a party files but fails to send a copy of to his opponent. 9 4. Discovery may be taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. 10 No further court order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(a)(2) or Local Rule 16 is 11 required before the parties may conduct discovery. 12 5. Plaintiff is responsible for prosecuting this case. Plaintiff must promptly keep the 13 Court informed of any change of address and must comply with the Court's orders in a timely 14 fashion. Failure to do so will result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant 15 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). 16 6. Plaintiff is cautioned that he must include the case name and case number for this 17 case on any document he submits to the Court for consideration in this case. 18 This order disposes of Docket Nos. 69, 71, 73, 75, 78, and 89. 19 20 IT IS SO ORDERED. 21 22 Dated: March 9, 2023 23 24

---

EDWARD M. CHEN

25 United States District Judge 26 27