

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Walker v. Ibarra

Walker · No. 24-cv-08900 EJD (PR) · Decided June 27, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California granted Plaintiff Jeffery Walker’s request to strike deficient claims in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The case will proceed on Fourteenth Amendment claims for failure to protect against Defendants Perez and Collins and deliberate indifference to medical needs against Defendants Pratt and Main; the remaining claims and defendants were stricken.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Edward J. Davila
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 27, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-08900 EJD (PR)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se civil detainee brought an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After screening the complaint and granting leave to amend or, alternatively, to strike deficient claims and proceed on cognizable claims, Plaintiff moved to strike the deficient claims. The court granted that request, directed service on the remaining defendants, and ordered the defendants to file a dispositive motion or notice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must screen a prisoner civil-rights complaint and dismiss claims that fail to state a claim or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. Pro se pleadings are liberally construed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- pleadings
- section 1983
- due process
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

constitutional law

prisoner and detainee rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's request to strike the deficient claims should be granted.
2. Which claims and defendants remained in the action after the deficient claims were stricken.
3. Whether the remaining failure-to-protect and deliberate-indifference allegations were cognizable under the Fourteenth Amendment.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted Plaintiff's request to strike the deficient claims and ordered that the action proceed only on the cognizable claims identified in the prior screening order.
2. A civil detainee states a cognizable Fourteenth Amendment claim for failure to protect when officials allegedly knew that another inmate posed a threat and failed to protect the detainee from harm; the allegations were cognizable against Defendants Perez and Collins.
3. A civil detainee's allegations that medical personnel refused appropriate treatment after an assault may state a cognizable deliberate-indifference claim under the Fourteenth Amendment; the allegations were cognizable against Defendants Pratt and Main.
4. The clerk was directed to serve Defendants Perez, Collins, Pratt, and Main, and the defendants were ordered to file a summary-judgment motion or other dispositive motion within ninety-one days of filing.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff was a civil detainee at the San Francisco County Jail. He alleged that officials allowed a known enemy to be housed near him and that the inmate later attacked him, causing injuries to his eye, lower back, and right arm. He also alleged that medical personnel refused to authorize hospital transport and diagnostic treatment after the assault.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a § 1983 complaint concerning conditions and medical care at the San Francisco County Jail. On May 14, 2025, the court screened the complaint, identified cognizable failure-to-protect and deliberate-indifference claims, and granted leave to amend as to other claims. Plaintiff elected to strike the deficient claims, and the court granted the request on June 27, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Department*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990)

- West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988)
- Youngberg v. Romeo, 457 U.S. 307, 315-16 (1982)
- Jones, 393 F.3d at 932
- Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 963 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc)
- Woods v. Carey, 684 F.3d 934, 940 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986)
- Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam)
- Brydges v. Lewis, 18 F.3d 651, 653 (9th Cir. 1994)