

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Kaleb Lee Basey v. Jolene Goeden, et al.

Basey · No. 1:26-cv-00001-SLG · Decided May 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Alaska granted Defendants’ motion to screen the prisoner-plaintiff’s complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The court held that screening was required because Plaintiff remained incarcerated, directed Defendants not to answer unless ordered, and reminded Plaintiff to comply with applicable federal and local rules.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Alaska
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sharon L. Gleason
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Alaska
DECIDED	May 13, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-00001-SLG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to require screening of Plaintiff's prisoner complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The court granted the motion and deferred screening of the complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Kaleb Lee Basey v. Jolene Goeden, et al.

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- civil procedure
- pleadings
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a federal district court must screen a prisoner's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A when the prisoner has paid the filing fee in full.

2. Whether Defendants' motion for screening should be granted based on Plaintiff's status as a prisoner seeking relief against the government.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court must screen a complaint brought by a prisoner seeking relief against a governmental entity, officer, or employee even when the prisoner has paid the filing fee in full.
2. Defendants' motion for screening at Docket 10 is granted, and Defendants need not answer or otherwise respond to the complaint unless and until ordered by the court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, a federal district court must screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity, even when the prisoner has paid the filing fee in full.”

“For these reasons, Defendants’ motion for screening at Docket 10 is GRANTED.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Kaleb Basey filed the action while incarcerated but provided a residential address and paid the filing fee, causing the court initially to issue an order intended for non-prisoner litigants. Defendants later advised that Basey was a prisoner seeking relief against the government. The court independently confirmed that Basey remained imprisoned at FMC Lexington in Federal Bureau of Prisons custody.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on January 12, 2026, paid the filing fee, and provided an address that led the court initially to treat him as a non-prisoner litigant. Defendants later informed the court that Plaintiff was imprisoned and sought screening under the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Plaintiff did not oppose the motion, and the court granted it.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Belanus v. Clark*, 796 F.3d 1021, 1029 (9th Cir. 2015)