

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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/tanbeer-singh-brar-v-state-of-california-76qdn6a0>