

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Paschall v. Johal

No. 1:24-cv-00154-JLT-SKO (E.D. Cal. June 3, 2025) · No. 1:24-cv-00154 JLT SKO · Decided June 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations concerning Lamar Paschall’s amended complaint. The court allowed Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims to proceed against several defendants, dismissed Amandeep Johal from the action, and dismissed the remaining claims.

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	June 4, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00154 JLT SKO
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's screening findings and recommendations concerning an amended prisoner civil-rights complaint. The court adopted the recommendations, allowed the Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims against Fu, Smith, Sinclair, Jane Doe, and John Doe to proceed, dismissed Johal, and dismissed the remaining claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Lamar Paschall v. Amandeep Johal, Fu, Smith, Sinclair, Jane Doe, John Doe

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- civil procedure
- government liability

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- prisoner civil rights
- constitutional law
- health law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted after de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
2. Whether Johal should be dismissed because the amended complaint failed to state a cognizable Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against him.
3. Whether the remaining noncognizable claims should be dismissed while the cognizable claims proceed.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full after conducting de novo review.
2. Paschall failed to state a cognizable claim against Johal, and Johal was dismissed from the action.
3. The Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims against Fu, Smith, Sinclair, Jane Doe, and John Doe may proceed, while the remaining claims are dismissed.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Paschall, a state prisoner housed at Sierra Conservation Center, alleged that defendants violated his constitutional rights. Screening of his amended complaint identified cognizable Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims against Fu, Smith, Sinclair, Jane Doe, and John Doe, but not against Johal, the institution's Chief Medical Officer. Paschall agreed to proceed only on the cognizable claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Paschall filed an amended complaint alleging constitutional violations while incarcerated at Sierra Conservation Center. After screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), the magistrate judge found cognizable Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims against five defendants but found no cognizable claim against Johal. Paschall elected to proceed only on the cognizable claims and filed no objections to the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations. The district court conducted de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and adopted the findings and recommendations in full.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)

OPINION

(PC) Paschall v. Johal

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 LAMAR PASCHALL, Case No.: 1:24-cv-00154 JLT SKO 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
ADOPTING FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING

13 v. DEFENDANT ARMANDEEP JOHAL FROM

THIS ACTION

14 AMANDEEP JOHAL, et al., (Doc. 16) 15 Defendants. 16 17 Lamar Paschall seeks to hold the
defendants liable for violations of his constitutional 18 rights while housed at Sierra Conservation
Center. (See Doc. 12.) The assigned magistrate judge 19 screened Plaintiff's amended complaint
pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a) and found Plaintiff 20 stated a cognizable claim for Eighth
Amendment deliberate indifference to serious medical needs 21 against Defendants Fu, Smith,
Sinclair, Jane Doe, and John Doe. (Doc. 13 at 4-10.) However, 22 the magistrate judge determined
that Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against Defendant 23 Johal, the Chief Medical
Officer at the institution. (Id. at 10.) In response to the Screening 24 Order, Plaintiff indicated his
willingness to proceed only on the cognizable claims. (Doc. 14.) 25 Following receipt of the notice
from Plaintiff, the magistrate judge reiterated the findings 26 made in the Screening Order and
recommended the action proceed only on the cognizable claims. 27 (Doc. 16.) In addition, the
magistrate judge recommended the Court dismiss Defendant Johal as a defendant and dismiss the
remaining claims in the complaint. (Id. at 2.) 1 The Court served the Findings and
Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him that 2 | any objections were due within 14 days.
(Doc. 16 at 2.) The Court advised him that the "failure 3 | to file any objections within the
specified time may result in the waiver of certain rights on 4 | appeal." (/d. at 2-3, citing Wilkerson
v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff 5 | did not file objections, and the time
to do so has passed. 6 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court conducted a de novo review
of this case. 7 | Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and
Recommendations to 8 || be supported by the record and proper analysis. Accordingly, the Court
ORDERS: 9 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on May 13, 2025 (Doc. 16) are 10
ADOPTED in full. 11 2. This action PROCEEDS on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment deliberate
indifference to 12 serious medical needs claims against Defendants Fu, Smith, Sinclair, Jane Doe,
and 13 John Doe. 14 3. Defendant Amandeep Johal is DISMISSED from this action. 15 4. Any
remaining claims in Plaintiff's complaint are DISMISSED. 16 5. The Clerk of Court is directed to
update the docket. 17 18 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 | Dated: _June 3, 2025 Charis [Tourn

TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28