

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Danielle Mari Rodriguez v. Housing Alliance and Community Partnerships (formerly Pocatello Housing Authority) and Dr. Jared Mangum

Rodriguez · No. 4:26-cv-00173-DCN · Decided March 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Idaho grants Danielle Rodriguez’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and waives the filing fee. The court finds her claims concerning termination of public housing assistance, alleged denial of due process, and failure to provide a disability-related reasonable accommodation legally sufficient to proceed past initial screening. The court declines to grant an ex parte temporary restraining order before hearing from the defendants and directs service of the litigation documents.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
DECIDED	March 30, 2026
DOCKET	4:26-cv-00173-DCN
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a complaint, an application to proceed in forma pauperis, and an emergency motion for an ex parte temporary restraining order. The district court granted in forma pauperis status, screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), allowed the claims to proceed, ordered service, and declined to grant ex parte emergency relief before hearing from defendants.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the court screened the in forma pauperis complaint to determine whether it was frivolous or malicious, failed to state a plausible claim for relief, or sought monetary relief from an immune defendant. At this preliminary stage, the court construed the pro se pleading liberally but did not determine the ultimate likelihood of success.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum decision and order; limited persuasive value

PARTIES

Danielle Mari Rodriguez v. Housing Alliance and Community Partnerships (formerly Pocatello Housing Authority), Dr. Jared Mangum

TOPICS

injunctions

civil procedure

pleadings

due process

reasonable accommodation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

disability rights

housing law

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Rodriguez qualified to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1).
2. Whether the complaint survived mandatory screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).
3. Whether the court should grant an emergency ex parte temporary restraining order before defendants had an opportunity to respond.

HOLDINGS

1. Rodriguez established that she was unable to pay the filing fee while providing for her necessities of life, and therefore qualified to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. The complaint survived initial screening because it was not frivolous or malicious, stated plausible claims for relief, and did not seek monetary relief from an immune defendant.
3. The court declined to grant ex parte emergency relief at that time because defendants had not yet been given an opportunity to respond and the asserted immediate harm was not sufficiently established.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“At face value, Rodriguez’s complaint survives an initial analysis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)”

“The Court is not determining the ultimate likelihood of success on any of Rodriguez’s causes of action”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Rodriguez had received public housing assistance for nearly ten years based on disabilities, with defendants paying approximately \$1,100 in monthly rent. After defendants requested annual recertification, identified deficiencies in her materials, and provided multiple opportunities and deadlines to correct them, they terminated her from the assistance program. Rodriguez alleged that the termination hearing did not satisfy the Fourteenth Amendment and that defendants failed to provide a reasonable accommodation under the Rehabilitation Act. She claimed that without assistance she would be required to pay rent from her limited income beginning April 1, 2026 and could become homeless.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Rodriguez alleged that defendants terminated her public housing assistance after an annual recertification process and asserted due process and disability-accommodation claims. On initial review, the court found the complaint nonfrivolous, legally sufficient, and not barred by defendant immunity. The court denied the emergency ex parte motion without prejudice to considering emergency relief after defendants had an opportunity to respond.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Rice v. City of Boise City, 2013 WL 6385657, at *1 (D. Idaho Dec. 6, 2013)
- Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948)
- United States v. McQuade, 647 F.2d 938, 940 (9th Cir. 1981)
- Jefferson v. United States, 277 F.2d 723, 725 (9th Cir. 1960)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)
- Resnick v. Hayes, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Pena v. Gardner, 976 F.2d 469, 471 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Jackson v. Carey, 353 F.3d 750, 758 (9th Cir. 2003)