1

2

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

17

20

21

FILED IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Oct 21, 2020

SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

JAMES D. GRIEPSMA,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUPERINTENDENT DONALD HOLBROOK, SERGEANT TORRESCANO, C/O ROBERT SMITH #7556, C/O RAILY, C/O DAHL, C/O HEY GROGAN, C/O ZARNT, C/O CORNAJO, C/O FARROW, C/O M. WALISER #7395, and PA-C JO ELLA PHILLIPS,

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION -- 1

Defendants.

NO: 4:20-CV-5111-RMP

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION

1915(g)

By Order filed August 19, 2020, the Court advised Plaintiff of the deficiencies of his complaint and directed him to amend or voluntarily dismiss within sixty (60) days. ECF No. 12. Plaintiff James D. Griepsma, a prisoner at the Washington State Penitentiary ("WSP"), is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*; Defendants have not been served. The Court cautioned Plaintiff that if he failed to amend his complaint or voluntarily dismiss this action, the Court

1 2

would dismiss it for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b)(1). ECF No. 12 at 24. The deadline to file has passed, and Plaintiff has filed nothing further in this action.

In his complaint, Plaintiff failed to present facts showing identified

Defendants used Oleoresin Capsicum ("O.C.") spray, also known as "pepper spray," against him, without justification and knowing Plaintiff had a "medical authorization" against the use of O.C. spray, rather than in a good faith effort to restore discipline and order. *See Clement v. Gomez*, 298 F.3d 898, 903 (9th Cir. 2002). He also failed to allege facts showing identified Defendants were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment. *Hudson v. McMillian*, 503 U.S. 1, 9 (1992); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976). He presented no facts to support his conclusory assertions of constitutional violations or speculations of future harm.

Although granted the opportunity to do so, Plaintiff did not allege facts indicating that the course of action by identified Defendants was medically unacceptable under the circumstances or was chosen in conscious disregard of an excessive risk to Plaintiff's health. *See Hamby v. Hammond*, 821 F.3d 1085, 1092 (9th Cir. 2016). Furthermore, Plaintiff's conclusory assertions of retaliation were insufficient to state a First Amendment claim. *See Rhodes v. Robinson*, 408 F.3d 559, 567–68 (9th Cir. 2005); *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1114–15 (9th Cir. 2012); *Brodheim v. Cry*, 584 F.3d 1262, 1269 (9th Cir. 2009).

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above and in the Order to Amend or Voluntarily Dismiss, ECF No. 12, **IT IS ORDERED** that this action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b)(1).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) a prisoner who brings three or more civil actions or appeals which are dismissed as frivolous or for failure to state a claim will be precluded from bringing any other civil action or appeal *in forma pauperis* "unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff is advised to read the statutory provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This dismissal of Plaintiff's complaint may count as one of the three dismissals allowed by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and may adversely affect his ability to file future claims *in forma pauperis*.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Clerk is directed to enter this Order, enter Judgment, provide copies to Plaintiff, and CLOSE the file. The District Court Clerk is further directed to provide a copy of this Order to the Office of the Attorney General of Washington, Corrections Division. The Court certifies that any appeal of this dismissal would not be taken in good faith.

DATED October 21, 2020.

s/Rosanna Malouf Peterson

ROSANNA MALOUF PETERSON

United States District Judge