

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

Forrest C. Taylor v. J. Leatherman, et al.

Taylor v. Leatherman · No. 2:25-cv-1100 CSK P · Decided October 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California addresses plaintiff Forrest C. Taylor’s filings in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The court strikes a duplicative filing, denies the request to add defendant C. Pierce through supplemental pleadings, and explains that any due process claims against Pierce must be pursued separately because they are improperly joined. The court grants Taylor thirty days to file a second amended complaint or proceed on the previously elected First and Eighth Amendment claims.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Chi Soo Kim                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| DECIDED               | October 22, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| DOCKET                | 2:25-cv-1100 CSK P                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | A state prisoner proceeding pro se under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 sought to add defendant C. Pierce and pursue additional claims after the court screened his first amended complaint and permitted amendment or election to proceed on specified First and Eighth Amendment claims. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished district court order; nonprecedential                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| PARTIES               | Forrest C. Taylor v. J. Leatherman, et al.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

TOPICS

- joinder
- motion to amend
- section 1983
- first amendment
- due process

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- constitutional law
- prisoner civil rights

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff could add C. Pierce through a supplemental pleading without alleging facts showing that Pierce violated plaintiff's constitutional rights.
2. Whether proposed due process claims against C. Pierce could be joined with plaintiff's existing First and Eighth Amendment claims against other defendants.
3. Whether plaintiff should be granted leave to file a second amended complaint re-alleging the existing claims and, if supported by specific facts, claims against C. Pierce.

## HOLDINGS

1. The request to add C. Pierce was denied because plaintiff provided no facts demonstrating that Pierce violated plaintiff's First or Eighth Amendment rights.
2. Any due process claim against C. Pierce arising from the disciplinary hearing could not be joined with plaintiff's First and Eighth Amendment claims against the other defendants because the claims did not arise from the same transaction or occurrence and would not present common questions of law or fact.
3. Plaintiff was granted thirty days to file a second amended complaint re-alleging the existing First and Eighth Amendment claims and including claims against C. Pierce only if he could allege specific facts showing that Pierce violated his First or Eighth Amendment rights.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“Unrelated claims against unrelated defendants belong in different suits”* (at 2)

*“any right to relief is asserted against them jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences”* (at 2)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is a state prisoner pursuing a § 1983 action based on alleged First and Eighth Amendment violations arising from prison events. After the court screened his first amended complaint, plaintiff elected to proceed on specified claims but also sought to add C. Pierce, who allegedly heard a prison disciplinary proceeding. The court found that plaintiff had not alleged facts showing Pierce violated his First or Eighth Amendment rights and stated that any due process claims concerning the disciplinary hearing would involve different legal and factual questions from the existing claims.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court screened plaintiff's first amended complaint on September 30, 2025, finding potentially cognizable Eighth Amendment claims against D. Leatherman, R. McLeod, D. Heinkel, and A. Konrad, and a First Amendment claim against J. Leatherman. Plaintiff elected to proceed on those claims and filed a document seeking to add C. Pierce through a supplemental pleading. The court struck a duplicative filing, denied the request to add Pierce because plaintiff alleged no facts showing a constitutional violation, and granted thirty days to file a second amended complaint consistent with the court's order.

## DISPOSITION

other

#### **CASES CITED**

- George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007)

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/forrest-c-taylor-v-j-leatherman-et-al-2er69bi8>