

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Davis v. Bobbla

Davis v. Bobbla · No. 3:24-cv-01276-JO-KSC · Decided July 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California dismissed Maurice Daronte Davis’s Sixth Amended Complaint without prejudice for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b). The court concluded that the claims were potentially time-barred, insufficiently alleged Dr. Sangha’s personal involvement, and did not plausibly establish deliberate indifference to serious medical needs, while granting one final opportunity to amend.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jinsook Ohta
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	July 1, 2025
DOCKET	3:24-cv-01276-JO-KSC
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a prisoner's Sixth Amended Complaint filed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Court screened the in forma pauperis complaint under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b) and assessed whether it stated a claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- statute of limitations
- civil procedure
- constitutional law

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- prisoner litigation
- constitutional law
- medical care

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's § 1983 inadequate-medical-care claim based on the 2011 denial of back surgery was barred by California's two-year statute of limitations.
2. Whether Plaintiff adequately alleged Dr. Sangha's personal participation in the alleged NSAID treatment and resulting kidney injury.
3. Whether Plaintiff adequately pleaded deliberate indifference under the Eighth Amendment based on Dr. Sangha's choice to treat him with NSAIDs rather than surgery.

HOLDINGS

1. The claim based on the 2011 denial of back surgery was barred by the applicable two-year statute of limitations because Plaintiff waited until 2022 to sue and pleaded no facts supporting statutory or equitable tolling.
2. Plaintiff failed to state a § 1983 claim based on long-term NSAID treatment and kidney injury because he did not adequately allege how Dr. Sangha personally participated in placing him on or maintaining that course of treatment.
3. Plaintiff failed to state an Eighth Amendment inadequate-medical-care claim because he did not allege facts showing that Dr. Sangha's choice of NSAIDs instead of surgery was medically unacceptable under the circumstances or was made in conscious disregard of an excessive risk to Plaintiff's health.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“to prevail on an Eighth Amendment claim for inadequate medical care, a plaintiff must show deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs.” (at 2-3)

“For the foregoing reasons, the Court DISMISSES Plaintiff’s Sixth Amended Complaint [Dkt. 22] without prejudice.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that Dr. Sangha denied back surgery in 2011 and that long-term treatment with NSAIDs resulted in kidney injury. The Court found that Plaintiff did not allege facts showing Dr. Sangha prescribed or continued the NSAID treatment, or that Dr. Sangha chose NSAID treatment in conscious disregard of an excessive risk to Plaintiff's health. Plaintiff filed suit in 2022, more than eleven years after the alleged denial of surgery.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff initially sued the Chief Medical Executive of California State Prison in Sacramento and later filed several amended complaints against various defendants. The Eastern District of California dismissed the Fifth Amended Complaint because the defendants were immune from suit or insufficiently identified. After transfer and the filing of a Sixth Amended Complaint naming Dr. Sangha as the sole defendant, the Southern District of California dismissed the pleading without prejudice for failure to state a claim, while granting one final opportunity to amend.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Wilson v. Garcia, 471 U.S. 261, 276-80 (1985)
- Pouncil v. Tilton, 704 F.3d 568, 573 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Jones v. Blanas, 393 F.3d 918, 928 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Seattle Audubon Soc. v. Robertson, 931 F.2d 590, 595 (9th Cir. 1991)
- Hinton v. Pac. Enters., 5 F.3d 391, 395 (9th Cir. 1993)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 676-77 (2009)
- Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978)
- Colwell v. Bannister, 763 F.3d 1060, 1066 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Toguchi v. Chung, 391 F.3d 1051, 1058 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Edwards v. Marin Park, 356 F.3d 1058, 1065 (9th Cir. 2004)