

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Raghvendra Singh v. California Department of Corrections and
Rehabilitation, et al.

Singh v. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation · No. 2:24-cv-3150-DAD-CSK · Decided
April 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The document is a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a prisoner civil-rights action brought by Raghvendra Singh against the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and others. The court recommends denying Singh’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissing the complaint without leave to amend because it is vague, fails to state a claim, and does not establish subject-matter jurisdiction. The recommendations also direct that the case be closed.

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	April 9, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-3150-DAD-CSK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff filed a civil-rights complaint and moved to proceed in forma pauperis. The magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending denial of IFP status, dismissal without leave to amend, and closure of the case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), an action proceeding in forma pauperis must be screened and dismissed if frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true unless clearly baseless or fanciful, construes them in the plaintiff's favor, liberally construes pro se pleadings, and disregards conclusory allegations, unreasonable inferences, and unwarranted factual deductions. A complaint must contain enough factual matter to state a facially plausible claim and

must provide fair notice under Rule 8. Subject-matter jurisdiction is reviewed independently and may be considered sua sponte.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE

nonprecedential

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction

pleadings

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

federal civil procedure

prisoner litigation

in forma pauperis proceedings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis sufficiently established inability to pay filing fees.
2. Whether the complaint stated a cognizable claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and the applicable pleading standards.
3. Whether the complaint established federal-question or diversity subject-matter jurisdiction.
4. Whether dismissal should be without leave to amend because amendment would be futile.

HOLDINGS

1. The IFP application did not make the financial showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), and the court recommended denial of IFP status because the action appeared facially frivolous and meritless.
2. The complaint failed to state a claim because it consisted of vague and conclusory allegations and did not identify specific acts by specific defendants sufficient to provide fair notice.
3. The complaint did not establish federal-question or diversity jurisdiction, and the court recommended dismissal for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.
4. Leave to amend should be denied because the complaint's deficiencies and lack of subject-matter jurisdiction made amendment futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“One need not be absolutely destitute to obtain benefits of the in forma pauperis statute.” (1)

“A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable.” (3)

“The Complaint should therefore be dismissed without leave to amend.” (4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that, while incarcerated from 2021 through 2024, prison doctors refused to treat hemorrhoids and other medical conditions, including thyroid problems, arthritis, sleeping problems, and psychiatric problems.

He also alleged that conditions in the M Yards were dangerous and asserted continuing discrimination and violations of law. He sought \$1 million in compensatory and punitive damages.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a two-page complaint alleging inadequate medical treatment and dangerous prison conditions, together with an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The magistrate judge concluded that the IFP application was insufficient, the complaint was frivolous and failed to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, and subject-matter jurisdiction was not established. The court recommended denial of IFP status and dismissal without leave to amend, subject to objections and review by the assigned district judge.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Escobedo v. Applebees, 787 F.3d 1226, 1234 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Minetti v. Port of Seattle, 152 F.3d 1113, 1115 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Tripathi v. First Nat. Bank & Tr., 821 F.2d 1368, 1370 (9th Cir. 1987)
- McGee v. Dep't of Child Support Servs., 584 Fed. App'x 638 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Smart v. Heinze, 347 F.2d 114, 116 (9th Cir. 1965)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126-27, 1130-31 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325-27 (1989)
- Von Saher v. Norton Simon Museum of Art at Pasadena, 592 F.3d 954, 960 (9th Cir. 2010), cert. denied, 564 U.S. 1037 (2011)
- Hebbe v. Pliler, 627 F.3d 338, 342 & n.7 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Western Mining Council v. Watt, 643 F.2d 618, 624 (9th Cir. 1981)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-57, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Cahill v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 80 F.3d 336, 339 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Kimes v. Stone, 84 F.3d 1121, 1129 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Singh v. California Dep't of Corr., 2024 WL 4382755 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2024)
- Singh v. California Dep't of Corr., 2024 WL 4626222 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2024)
- Singh v. California Dep't of Corr. & Rehab., 2025 WL 83030 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 13, 2025)
- Singh v. California Dep't of Corr. & Rehab., 2025 WL 524988 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2025)
- Jones v. Community Redev. Agency, 733 F.2d 646, 649 (9th Cir. 1984)
- McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1178-80 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994)
- Casey v. Lewis, 4 F.3d 1516, 1519 (9th Cir. 1993)

- *Bender v. Williamsport Area Sch. Dist.*, 475 U.S. 534, 546 (1986)
- *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Cal. State Bd. of Equalization*, 858 F.2d 1376, 1380 (9th Cir. 1988)
- *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 141 (2012)
- *Cato v. United States*, 70 F.3d 1103, 1105-06 (9th Cir. 1995)
- *Turner v. Duncan*, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998)
- *Martinez v. Yist*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1156-57 (9th Cir. 1991)

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/raghvendra-singh-v-california-department-of-corrections-and-2zs3drst>