

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Tanbeer Singh Brar v. State of California

Brar · No. 1:25-cv-01046 JLT CDB · Decided September 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted findings and recommendations and dismissed Tanbeer Singh Brar’s action against the State of California with prejudice. The court held that the claims arising from an alleged false arrest on April 22, 2021, were barred by the applicable statute of limitations and the Eleventh Amendment. The court also denied related relief and directed the Clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 19, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01046 JLT CDB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court conducted de novo review of a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after Plaintiff filed objections. The court adopted the findings and recommendations and dismissed the action with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) of the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations to which objections were made.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reported citation or stated precedential designation.
PARTIES	Tanbeer Singh Brar v. State of California

TOPICS

- statute of limitations
- eleventh amendment immunity
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure
- injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action was barred by the applicable statute of limitations.
2. Whether Brar's false-arrest claim against the State of California was barred by the Eleventh Amendment.
3. Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted after de novo review.
4. Whether Brar was entitled to a temporary restraining order despite the limitations and sovereign-immunity barriers.

HOLDINGS

1. The action was time-barred because Brar was on notice of the factual basis for his claims on April 22, 2021, and he did not establish that any tolling statute applied.
2. Brar's false-arrest claim against the State of California was barred by the Eleventh Amendment.
3. After de novo review, the district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full.
4. The motion for a temporary restraining order was denied because the limitations and sovereign-immunity bars prevented Brar from establishing a likelihood of success on the merits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"This action (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE as time-barred and barred under the Eleventh Amendment." (2)

"Rule 11 is intended to deter baseless filings in district court and imposes a duty of reasonable inquiry so that anything filed with the court is well grounded in fact, legally tenable, and not interposed for any improper purpose." (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Brar alleged that he was falsely arrested and subjected to unlawful force on April 22, 2021, and sought to hold the State of California liable for personal injury and civil-rights violations. He did not allege facts establishing tolling of the applicable limitations period. His objections did not meaningfully address the limitations or sovereign-immunity grounds and included a purported fictitious legal document.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Brar, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed claims against the State of California arising from an alleged April 22, 2021 false arrest and related civil-rights violations. On August 25, 2025, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal because the claims were barred by the statute of limitations and the Eleventh Amendment. After reviewing Brar's objections de novo, the district court adopted the recommendations in full, dismissed the action with prejudice, denied the temporary restraining order, terminated miscellaneous relief as moot, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Islamic Shura Council of S. Cal. v. F.B.I., 757 F.3d 870, 872 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Warren v. Guelker, 29 F.3d 1386, 1390 (9th Cir. 1994)
- Townsend v. Holman Consulting Corp., 929 F.2d 1358, 1362 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Zaldivar v. City of Los Angeles, 780 F.2d 823, 832 (9th Cir. 1986)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 TANBEER SINGH BRAR, Case No. 1:25-cv-01046 JLT CDB 12 Plaintiff,
ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING 13 v. ACTION
WITH PREJUDICE AS TIME- BARRED AND BARRED UNDER THE 14 STATE OF
CALIFORNIA, ELEVENTH AMENDMENT 15 Defendant. (Docs. 3, 4, 6) 16 17 Tanbeer Singh
Brar, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, seeks to hold the State of 18 California liable for
personal injury and the violation of his civil rights, alleging he was falsely arrested 19 on April 22,
2021.

(Doc. 1 at 5, 41, 46.) 20 After having conducted a preliminary review of Plaintiff's complaint, on
August 25, 2025, the 21 assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations that this
action be dismissed with 22 prejudice because Plaintiff's claims are time-barred under the
applicable statute of limitations. (Doc. 3.) 23 The magistrate judge found that "Plaintiff was on
notice of the bases of his current claim on April 22, 24 2021, when he alleged that was the date he
was unlawfully arrested[,] that Plaintiff "has not alleged 25 whether his claims are tolled, and the
[magistrate judge] does not find any tolling statutes applicable 26 here." (Id. at 5.)

The magistrate further found that Plaintiff's false arrest claim against the State of 27 California
would be barred under the Eleventh Amendment. (Id.) 28 1 4.) Plaintiff's objections are not
responsive to either the time-bar issue or the sovereign immunity issue. 2 He fails to cite to any
authority supporting his conclusory allegation that he can bring his claim for false 3 arrest and
unlawful force "within [seven] years." Further, he objects pursuant to to 28 U.S.C. § 455 4 based
on his motion to disqualify the assigned magistrate judge and the undersigned that was 5
contemporaneously filed with his objections (Doc.

5), which was denied by the Court on September 18, 6 2025. (Doc. 8.) Plaintiff's objections
include what appears to be a fictitious, signed document from the 7 "United State [sic] of America
Commissions on Councils of Districts" that purportedly commands the 8 Court to "change officers
on all proceedings of [Plaintiff]" and award him \$97,000.00. (Doc. 4 at 4.)

9 Plaintiff is advised that filing fictitious legal documents before the Court violates Federal Rule of
10 Civil Procedure 11(b) and could expose Plaintiff to the imposition of sanctions, up to and
including 11 financial sanctions and the dismissal of his action. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)
(requirement for a party to 12 certify that to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief that
a filing presented to the Court, inter 13 alia, “is not being presented for any improper purpose[,] ...
the claims, defenses, and other legal 14 contentions are warranted by existing law or by a
nonfrivolous argument[,] ... [and] the factual 15 contentions have evidentiary support, or if
specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support 16 after a reasonable opportunity for
further investigation or discovery[.]”); see id. 11(c); Islamic Shura 17 Council of S. Cal. v. F.B.I.,
757 F.3d 870, 872 (9th Cir.

2014) (“Rule 11 is intended to deter baseless 18 filings in district court and imposes a duty of
reasonable inquiry so that anything filed with the court is 19 well grounded in fact, legally tenable,
and not interposed for any improper purpose.”) (internal quotation 20 marks omitted); Warren v.
Guelker, 29 F.3d 1386, 1390 (9th Cir. 1994) (“Rule 11 applies to pro se 21 plaintiffs[.]”);
Townsend v. Holman Consulting Corp., 929 F.2d 1358, 1362 (9th Cir.

1990) (“Our cases 22 have established that sanctions must be imposed on the signer of a paper if
either a) the paper is filed for 23 an improper purpose, or b) the paper is ‘frivolous.’”) (citing
Zaldivar v. City of Los Angeles, 780 F.2d 24 823, 832 (9th Cir. 1986).)

Therefore, Plaintiff has not shown he is able to escape the time bar of the 25 statute of limitations
or the issue of sovereign immunity in pursuing his action against the State of 26 California.¹ 27 1
For these reasons, Plaintiff’s motion for temporary restraining order (TRO) (Doc. 6) is also
DENIED.

Because Plaintiff’s 28 action is time-barred and barred under the Eleventh Amendment, he is
unable to establish that he is likely to succeed on the 1 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this
Court performed a de novo review of this case.

Having 2 || carefully reviewed the matter entire matter, including Plaintiff’s objections, the Court
concludes the 3 || findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.
Thus, the Court 4 || ORDERS: 5 1.

The findings and recommendations issued August 25, 2025 (Doc. 3) are ADOPTED IN 6 FULL. 7
2. This action (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE as time-barred and barred under 8 the
Eleventh Amendment. 9 3. The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to terminate Plaintiff’s motion
for miscellaneous relief 10 (Doc. 7) as moot and to CLOSE THIS CASE. 11 tr Is SO ORDERED.

12: Dated: _ September 19, 2025: 13 Cari (Town 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

