

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Jessie Payne-Rana v. B. Wood, David Pedro, J. White, and C. Schrudder

No. 2:24-cv-01984-MO (D. Or. Feb. 4, 2026) · No. No. 2:24-cv-01984-MO · Decided February 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon granted defendants’ motion for summary judgment in Jessie Payne-Rana’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 First Amendment retaliation action. The court held that the evidence did not show that Sergeant Wood knew of any protected complaints when he filed a prison misconduct report, and that Payne-Rana presented no viable retaliation claims against the other defendants. The court dismissed the action with prejudice and alternatively concluded that the defendants were entitled to qualified immunity.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael W. Mosman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	February 4, 2026
DOCKET	No. 2:24-cv-01984-MO
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved for summary judgment on Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 First Amendment retaliation claims. The court granted the motion and dismissed the action with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court viewed the facts and reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. The court also applied the qualified-immunity framework, asking whether the facts showed a constitutional violation and, if so, whether the right was clearly established.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Jessie Payne-Rana v. B. Wood, David Pedro, J. White, C. Schrudder

TOPICS

section 1983 first amendment prisoners rights qualified immunity summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights constitutional law prisoner litigation federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the undisputed evidence created a genuine issue of material fact that Sergeant Wood submitted a misconduct report in retaliation for Payne-Rana's protected complaints.
2. Whether Payne-Rana stated or supported a First Amendment retaliation claim against Superintendent Pedro and Officers White and Schruder.
3. Whether Defendants were entitled to qualified immunity.

HOLDINGS

1. Sergeant Wood was entitled to summary judgment because the undisputed evidence showed that he did not know of any complaint by Payne-Rana or his mother when he submitted the misconduct report, defeating the causation element of the retaliation claim.
2. Superintendent Pedro and Officers White and Schruder were entitled to summary judgment because Payne-Rana failed to allege facts showing their personal involvement in a First Amendment retaliation violation.
3. Defendants were independently entitled to qualified immunity because the alleged conduct did not violate Payne-Rana's First Amendment rights, and no reasonable official would have understood submission of the misconduct charge to be unlawful under the circumstances.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In the prison context, a First Amendment retaliation claim under 42 U.S.C § 1983 must establish that a state actor took a harmful action against a prisoner because of that prisoner’s protected conduct and that the action did not “reasonably advance a legitimate correctional goal.”” (at 6)

“Accordingly, I find that Sergeant Wood is entitled to summary judgment on Payne-Rana’s retaliation claim because the undisputed evidence shows that Sergeant Wood did not know about any complaints Payne-Rana may have made about him at the time that he submitted the misconduct report on August 30, 2023.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Payne-Rana was incarcerated at Eastern Oregon Correctional Institution. During an August 23, 2023 visiting-room incident involving his mother and niece, staff observed conduct they considered inappropriate, inappropriate messages on a whiteboard, and statements by Payne-Rana threatening to bring MS-13 to the prison. Sergeant Wood terminated the visit and later submitted a misconduct report, resulting in findings against Payne-Rana on charges including disrespect, disobedience, and extortion. Payne-Rana alleged that the

misconduct report and other conduct were retaliation for complaints against Wood, but the record showed no evidence that Wood knew of any protected complaint before submitting the report.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Payne-Rana, proceeding pro se and while incarcerated, filed a complaint and then an amended complaint. The court dismissed his Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment claims for failure to state a claim and allowed only his First Amendment retaliation claims to proceed. After discovery and briefing, Defendants moved for summary judgment, which the court granted.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Nissan Fire & Marine Insurance Co. v. Fritz Companies, 210 F.3d 1099, 1102 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 324 (1986)
- Scott v. Harris, 550 U.S. 372, 380 (2007)
- Rhodes v. Robinson, 408 F.3d 559, 567-68 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Watison v. Carter, 668 F.3d 1108, 1114 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Gonzalez v. City of Anaheim, 747 F.3d 789, 793 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 242, 248-49 (1986)
- Pratt v. Rowland, 65 F.3d 802, 807-08 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Cornwell v. Electra Central Credit Union, 439 F.3d 1018, 1026 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Rico v. Ducart, 980 F.3d 1292, 1303 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Pearson v. Callahan, 555 U.S. 223, 232 (2009)
- DeFrancesco v. Robbins, 136 F.4th 933, 938-39 (9th Cir. 2025)
- Ashcroft v. al-Kidd, 563 U.S. 731 (2011)
- Barnett v. Centoni, 31 F.3d 813, 815-16 (9th Cir. 1994)