

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Ricardo Ray Anguiano v. Ashly Ketcher, et al.

Anguiano · No. 26-CV-166-JFH-JAR · Decided June 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma screened Ricardo Ray Anguiano’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint as a pretrial detainee and found that it failed to state a plausible claim for relief. The court dismissed the complaint without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), granting leave to file an amended complaint within twenty-one days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John F. Heil III
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	June 22, 2026
DOCKET	26-CV-166-JFH-JAR
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Preliminary screening of a self-represented pretrial detainee’s complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court screens the complaint and dismisses claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court evaluates whether the specific allegations plausibly support a legal claim for relief and liberally construes a self-represented pleading, without relieving the plaintiff of the obligation to allege sufficient supporting facts.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Ricardo Ray Anguiano v. Ashly Ketcher, Ralph Tucker, other unknown defendants

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

pleading and screening

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a plausible Fourteenth Amendment claim based on the alleged forced exposure of detainees' bodies during laundry procedures.
2. Whether the complaint stated a plausible § 1983 claim based on allegedly inadequate blankets, towels, cleaning supplies, and running water when it failed to allege the personal involvement of any defendant.
3. Whether the complaint should be dismissed without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1) and whether leave to amend should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. A prisoner civil-rights complaint must be dismissed at screening when its factual allegations fail to plausibly support a cognizable claim for relief.
2. The complaint failed to state a plausible Fourteenth Amendment claim because it did not allege a qualifying physical or sexual injury and did not plausibly allege that the exposure was unrelated to a legitimate governmental objective or excessive in relation to that objective.
3. A § 1983 claim fails when the complaint does not allege each defendant's personal involvement in the asserted constitutional deprivation.
4. A self-represented plaintiff whose complaint is dismissed for failure to state a claim should be permitted an opportunity to amend when the identified deficiencies may be curable.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In determining whether dismissal is appropriate, a court must “look to the specific allegations in the complaint to determine whether they plausibly support a legal claim for relief.”” (Order)

“While the Court must liberally construe a complaint drafted by a self-represented plaintiff, the rule of liberal construction “does not relieve the plaintiff of the burden of alleging sufficient facts on which a recognized legal claim could be based.”” (Order)

“Individual liability under § 1983 must be based on personal involvement in the alleged constitutional violation.” (Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Anguiano, a pretrial detainee at the Cherokee County Detention Center, alleged that detention-center personnel required detainees to remove clothing and wrap themselves in blankets while laundry was performed, allegedly threatening lockdown for noncompliance. He also alleged that detainees were denied clean blankets and towels for more than a month, lacked cleaning supplies, and had no running water in their cells. The complaint did not specifically allege a physical injury from the first incident or identify any defendant's personal involvement in the second.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Anguiano filed a pro se § 1983 complaint against detention-center personnel and unnamed individuals. On preliminary screening, the court concluded that the complaint failed to state a plausible claim for relief. The court dismissed the complaint without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), while granting twenty-one days to file an amended complaint curing the identified deficiencies.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Alvarado v. KOB TV, LLC, 493 F.3d 1210, 1215 n.2 (10th Cir. 2007)
- Hall v. Bellmon, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991)
- Milledge v. McCall, 43 F. App'x 196, 197-99 (10th Cir. 2002)
- Griffith v. El Paso Cnty., Colo., 129 F.4th 790, 824 (10th Cir. 2025)
- Hudson v. Palmer, 468 U.S. 517, 527 (1984)
- Foote v. Spiegel, 118 F.3d 1416, 1423 (10th Cir. 1997)
- Robbins v. Oklahoma, 519 F.3d 1242, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008)
- Estate of Booker v. Gomez, 745 F.3d 405, 435 (10th Cir. 2014)
- Galbraith v. Garfield Cnty. Jail, No. CIV-26-301-J, 2026 WL 1256441, at *2 (W.D. Okla. May 7, 2026)