

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Alexis v. Contreras

No. 25-cv-1625-DMS-DDL (S.D. Cal. June 30, 2025) · No. 25-cv-1625-DMS-DDL · Decided June 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California grants Laura Alexis’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The court dismisses her ADA complaint without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) for failure to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, allowing her 45 days to file an amended complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dana M. Sabraw
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	June 30, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-1625-DMS-DDL
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed an action alleging violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act and moved to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted in forma pauperis status and sua sponte screened and dismissed the complaint without prejudice for failure to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For mandatory screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), the court applied the same standard as Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), accepting factual allegations as true and assessing whether the complaint plausibly stated a claim. The court also applied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2)'s requirement of a short and plain statement showing entitlement to relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Laura Alexis v. Nicolas Contreras, et al.

TOPICS

pleadings

civil procedure

ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

disability discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff qualified to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).
2. Whether the complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and plausibly stated an ADA claim sufficient to avoid dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff demonstrated that she was unable to pay the filing fee, so the court granted her motion to proceed in forma pauperis and declined to impose an initial partial filing fee.
2. The complaint failed to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and failed to state a claim because its disjointed allegations did not clearly identify the defendants, relevant facts, or basis for the ADA claims; the complaint was therefore dismissed without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint that is too verbose, long, confusing, redundant, irrelevant, or conclusory may be dismissed for failure to comply with Rule 8.” (2)

“As pleaded, Plaintiff’s Complaint does not afford Defendants a fair opportunity to defend themselves.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Laura Alexis, proceeding pro se, filed a complaint alleging violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act against public officials, court agents, and other individuals. Although the complaint referenced the ADA, its timeline was disjointed and difficult to follow, and it did not clearly identify which individuals were being sued or which facts supported the asserted ADA claims. The court concluded that the pleading did not provide defendants a fair opportunity to defend themselves.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 26, 2025, Laura Alexis filed a complaint against public officials, court agents, and other individuals alleging ADA violations, together with a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court found that her affidavit established inability to pay, granted IFP status, and declined to impose an initial partial filing fee. On mandatory IFP screening, the court dismissed the complaint without prejudice and allowed amendment within forty-five days.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1051 (9th Cir. 2007)
- Soldani v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec., 2019 WL 2160380, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2019)
- Beasley v. San Diego Cnty. Sheriff’s Dep’t, 2023 WL 4918306, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2023)
- Nordstrom v. Ryan, 762 F.3d 903, 920 n.1 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Wheeler v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc., 689 F.3d 680, 681 (7th Cir. 2012)
- Watison v. Carter, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)
- Knapp v. Hogan, 738 F.3d 1106, 1109 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Cafasso v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., 637 F.3d 1047, 1058-59 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 840 (9th Cir. 2000)