

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

S.K., et al. v. State of Oregon, et al.

S.K. · No. 6:25-cv-939-MC · Decided April 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon denied Defendants’ Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss Plaintiff E.G.’s claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court held that the claims were not plainly time-barred because the complaint plausibly alleged delayed discovery of the constitutional injuries and their cause. The court also held that the allegations plausibly stated supervisory-liability claims against the individual defendants for allegedly failing to respond to known sexual abuse in Oregon Youth Authority custody.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael J. McShane
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	April 14, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-939-MC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss Counts I and II of Plaintiff E.G.'s First Amended Complaint, which asserted individual-capacity claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for alleged Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment violations.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts factual allegations as true, draws reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, and asks whether the complaint states a facially plausible claim for relief. A statute-of-limitations defense may be resolved on a motion to dismiss only when the running of the limitations period is apparent on the face of the complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- section 1983
- statute of limitations
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil rights

Federal civil procedure

Prisoners' rights

Constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether E.G.'s § 1983 claims were barred by the applicable statute of limitations at the pleading stage.
2. Whether E.G. plausibly alleged that the individual OYA defendants were liable under § 1983 for their own supervisory conduct, including knowingly failing to stop or prevent the alleged abuse.

HOLDINGS

1. The claims were not subject to dismissal as time-barred because the running of the statute of limitations was not apparent on the face of the complaint, and the allegations plausibly supported delayed discovery of the constitutional injuries and their cause.
2. E.G. plausibly alleged that the individual defendants were liable in their individual capacities for their own supervisory conduct because they knew or reasonably should have known of the physician's abuse and failed to take reasonable steps to stop it or protect youth in OYA custody.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“On a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, the court must presume all factual allegations of the complaint to be true and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party.”

“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 for the misconduct alleged.”

“A sufficient causal connection between the supervisor’s wrongful conduct and the constitutional violation exists when a supervisor “knowingly refus[ed] to terminate a series of acts by others, which [the supervisor] knew or reasonably should have known would cause others to inflict a constitutional injury”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

E.G. was adjudicated delinquent and held in Oregon Youth Authority custody, including at MacLaren Correctional Facility, between 2001 and 2006. He alleged that a MacLaren pediatrician sexually abused him during several medical examinations when E.G. was approximately fifteen years old. E.G. further alleged that OYA officials knew or reasonably should have known of the physician's abuse and failed to take reasonable steps to stop it or protect youth in custody. He alleged that he did not discover the constitutional injuries, their causal connection, and Defendants' responsibility until less than two years before filing suit.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

E.G. was one of two plaintiffs in an action against the State of Oregon, the Oregon Youth Authority, and individual OYA officials. Defendants moved to dismiss E.G.'s first and second claims as untimely and insufficiently pleaded to establish supervisory liability under § 1983. The district court denied the motion, concluding that the limitations defense was not apparent on the face of the complaint and that the allegations plausibly stated claims for relief.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Burget v. Lokelani Bernice Pauahi Bishop Trust*, 200 F.3d 661, 663 (9th Cir. 2000)
- *Usher v. City of Los Angeles*, 828 F.2d 556, 561 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 676, 678-79 (2009)
- *Nayab v. Cap. One Bank (USA), N.A.*, 942 F.3d 480, 496 (9th Cir. 2019)
- *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 556, 570 (2007)
- *Berk v. Choy*, 146 S. Ct. 546, 553 (2026)
- *Jones v. Blanas*, 393 F.3d 918, 927 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *Bonneau v. Centennial Sch. Dist. No. 28J*, 666 F.3d 577, 580-81 (9th Cir. 2012)
- *Lukovsky v. City and Cnty. of S.F.*, 535 F.3d 1044, 1049 (9th Cir. 2008)
- *Ward v. Westinghouse Can., Inc.*, 32 F.3d 1405, 1407 (9th Cir. 1994)
- *St. Clair v. Cnty. of Okanogan*, 154 F.4th 1154, 1156-60 (2025)
- *Simmons v. United States*, 805 F.2d 1363 (9th Cir. 1986)
- *U.S. ex rel. Air Control Techs., Inc. v. Pre Con Indus., Inc.*, 720 F.3d 1174, 1178 (9th Cir. 2013)
- *Von Saher v. Norton Simon Museum of Art at Pasadena*, 592 F.3d 954, 969 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Doe v. Reese*, No. 3:24-CV-02011-AB, 2026 WL 125380, at *3 (D. Or. Jan. 16, 2026)
- *Doe v. County of Josephine*, 2015 WL 2412181, at *2 (D. Or. 2015)
- *Keates v. Koile*, 883 F.3d 1228, 1242-43 (9th Cir. 2018)
- *Starr v. Baca*, 652 F.3d 1202, 1204-08 (9th Cir. 2011)
- *Dubner v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 266 F.3d 959, 968 (9th Cir. 2001)