

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished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)