Case 3:04-cv-05354-FDB Document 13 Filed 10/04/2004 Page 1 of 2 996928 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 9 AT TACOMA 10 GEORGE HENDRICKS, 11 Plaintiff, Case No. C04-5354FDB 12 ٧. ORDER DISMISSING FRIVOLOUS 13 JOHN MCNEISH, **COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO 28** U.S.C. § 1915 14 Defendant. 15 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, alleges that Defendant, his trial attorney discriminated against him 16 and violated his constitutional rights by not providing adequate representation. Plaintiff was advised 17 of certain deficiencies with his § 1983 complaint against Defendant, a private party, who did not act 18 under color of state law, and Plaintiff filed an amended complaint. Because the amended complaint 19 does not present a § 1983 claim because Plaintiff's trial attorney did not act under color of state law, 20 the Magistrate Judge recommends the Complaint be dismissed as frivolous. 21 Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation arguing the liability of municipal 22

Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation arguing the liability of municipal agents and contending that Defendant's private duties conflicted with his public duties to his client, that Defendant is not immune where acts of the state could be construed as acts of Defendant and where Defendant performed administrative or investigative acts.

ORDER - 1

23

24

25

26

1	Plaintiff's contentions are incorrect. The Ninth Circuit addressed the issue of whether a
2	public defender was a state actor, and the Court explained:
3	The issue before us, however, is whether in providing inadequate representation to
4	this defendant, Rigsby was acting on behalf of the Clark County government, so as to become a state actor within the meaning of § 1983. He was, no doubt, paid by
5	government funds and hired by a government agency. Nevertheless, his function was to represent his client, not the interests of the state or county.
6	Miranda v. Clark County, Nevada, 319 F.3d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 2003). Plaintiff's contentions are
7	incorrect, and the Report and Recommendation will be adopted. NOW, THEREFORE,
8	IT IS ORDERED:
9	1. The Court adopts the Report and Recommendation;
10	2. Plaintiff's Complaint is DISMISSED as frivolous;
11	3. The clerk is directed to terminate this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) and to
12	count this as a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g); and
13	4. The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and to the Hon. J. Kelley
14	Arnold.
15	DATED this 4 <sup>th</sup> day of October, 2004.
16	
17	<u>S/ Franklin D. Burgess</u> FRANKLIN D. BURGESS
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	ORDER - 2

Filed 10/04/2004 Page 2 of 2

Case 3:04-cv-05354-FDB Document 13