

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Tyree Raybon Ruffins v. R. Din

Ruffins v. Din · No. 25-cv-00267-AJB-SBC · Decided January 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California dismissed Tyree Raybon Ruffins’s amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint against Lieutenant R. Din for failure to state a claim. The court concluded that the amended pleading failed to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and did not plausibly allege an Eighth Amendment failure-to-protect claim. The court denied further leave to amend as futile, certified that an IFP appeal would not be taken in good faith, and directed entry of final judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Anthony J. Battaglia
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	January 30, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-00267-AJB-SBC
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a pro se prisoner’s amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint filed in forma pauperis.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) plausibility standard during mandatory screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b). Pro se pleadings were construed liberally, but the court could not supply essential elements or facts not pleaded.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Tyree Raybon Ruffins v. R. Din

TOPICS

- pleadings
- motions to dismiss
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and stated a plausible claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
2. Whether the amended complaint should be dismissed during mandatory prisoner and in forma pauperis screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and 1915A(b)(1).
3. Whether further leave to amend should be denied as futile after Ruffins failed to cure deficiencies identified in the prior dismissal order.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint failed to comply with Rule 8 and failed to state a plausible claim for relief because it did not clearly identify the defendant and claims, allege a jurisdictional basis, provide sufficient factual content connecting Din to actionable misconduct, or request relief.
2. The court was required to dismiss the amended complaint sua sponte because it failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted.
3. Further leave to amend was properly denied as futile because Ruffins had already been given notice of the pleading deficiencies and failed to cure them in the amended complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[A]n amended pleading supersedes the original.” (at 3)

“Something labeled a complaint but written more as a press release, prolix in evidentiary detail, yet without simplicity, conciseness and clarity as to whom plaintiffs are suing for what wrongs, fails to perform the essential functions of a complaint.” (at 5)

“Instead, Plaintiff must re-name the parties he intends to sue, and contain within his amended pleading ‘sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a [§ 1983] claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” (at 6)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ruffins, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, alleged that Lieutenant Din mishandled or falsified a CDCR 128-B marriage chrono after Ruffins fought with another prisoner, Wilson. Ruffins asserted that approximately two years later both prisoners were transferred to the same prison, where the chrono allegedly placed him at risk. The amended pleading merely asserted that he had stated valid facts and referred to the chrono, without alleging the injury caused, Din’s knowledge of the future transfers, or facts showing deliberate indifference to a substantial risk of harm.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ruffins initially alleged that Lieutenant R. Din violated his constitutional rights by mishandling a CDCR known-enemy or marriage chrono after a fight between Ruffins and another prisoner. The court previously dismissed the

original complaint under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and 1915A(b)(1), identified pleading deficiencies, and granted leave to amend. Ruffins filed a two-page letter labeled an amended complaint, which supplied less factual detail and did not cure the deficiencies. The court dismissed the amended complaint, denied further leave to amend as futile, certified that an appeal would not be taken in good faith, and directed entry of final judgment.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 833, 834, 837 (1994)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126–27 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)
- Rhodes v. Robinson, 621 F.3d 1002, 1004 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Nordstrom v. Ryan, 762 F.3d 903, 920 n.1 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Long v. Sugai, 91 F.4th 1331, 1336 (9th Cir. 2024)
- Watison v. Carter, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Wilhelm v. Rotman, 680 F.3d 1113, 1121 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677–78 (2009)
- Shroyer v. New Cingular Wireless Servs., Inc., 622 F.3d 1035, 1041 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Navarro v. Block, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Hebbe v. Pliler, 627 F.3d 338, 342 n.7 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Chapman v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.) Inc., 631 F.3d 939, 954 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Gibson v. City of Portland, --- F.5th ---, No. 24-1663, 2026 WL 235118, at *16, *18 (9th Cir. Jan. 29, 2026)
- Watson v. Chessman, 362 F. Supp. 2d 1190, 1194 (S.D. Cal. 2005)
- Berk v. Choy, 607 U.S. ---, --- S. Ct. ---, No. 24-440, 2026 WL 135974, at *4 (U.S. Jan. 20, 2026)
- Bell Atlantic v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 & n.3, 570 (2007)
- McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1177–78, 1180 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Exmundo v. Kane, 553 F. App'x 742, 743 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Hearn v. San Bernardino Police Dept., 530 F.3d 1124, 1132 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Morrison v. United States, 270 F. App'x 514, 515 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Zucco Partners, LLC v. Digimarc Corp., 552 F.3d 981, 1007 (9th Cir. 2009)