

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Hopson v. Chavez

No. 1:24-cv-00474-BAM (PC) (E.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2026) · No. 1:24-cv-00474-BAM (PC) · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California recommends dismissing Ryan Joel Hopson’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action with prejudice. The recommendation is based on failure to state a claim, failure to obey the Court’s order to amend, and failure to prosecute. The Court also directs the Clerk to randomly assign a district judge and provides a fourteen-day period for objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Barbara A. McAuliffe
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00474-BAM (PC)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Magistrate judge screening prisoner complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and recommending dismissal.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	28 U.S.C. § 1915A screening standard
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- section 1983
- pleadings
- joinder
- sanctions
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure
- first amendment

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- prisoner litigation
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint states a cognizable claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983

2. Whether Plaintiff properly joined claims and parties under Rules 18 and 20
3. Whether Plaintiff failed to prosecute and obey the court order to amend
4. Whether Plaintiff established supervisory liability
5. Whether injunctive relief is moot

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint fails to state a cognizable claim because it contains conclusory allegations without sufficient factual detail linking specific defendants to the alleged constitutional violations.
2. The complaint improperly joins unrelated claims against unrelated parties in a single action in violation of Rules 18 and 20.
3. Dismissal with prejudice is the appropriate sanction for Plaintiff's failure to file an amended complaint as ordered and failure to prosecute.
4. Supervisory liability cannot be based on respondeat superior; Plaintiff must show the supervisor participated in, directed, or knew of violations and failed to act, or implemented a deficient policy.
5. Injunctive relief is moot because Plaintiff is no longer housed at the jail where the alleged incidents occurred.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed a civil rights complaint against county jail officials alleging numerous constitutional violations including mail delays, unsanitary conditions, inadequate food, and racial discrimination. The complaint was 29 pages long and made conclusory allegations without linking specific defendants to specific wrongs.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se and in forma pauperis civil rights complaint. The Court screened the complaint, found deficiencies under Rules 8, 18, and 20, and granted leave to amend. Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint or otherwise communicate with the Court.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The Clerk of Court is ordered to randomly assign a District Judge to the action. The Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the assigned District Judge for review.

CASES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)

- Doe I v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 572 F.3d 677 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Moss v. U.S. Secret Serv., 572 F.3d 962 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs., 436 U.S. 658 (1978)
- Rizzo v. Goode, 423 U.S. 362 (1976)
- Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740 (9th Cir. 1978)
- Campbell v. Washington Dep't of Soc. Servs., 671 F.3d 837 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Ketchum v. Alameda Cty., 811 F.2d 1243 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Powell v. Cook Cty. Jail, 814 F. Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1993)
- Shaw v. Fresno Cnty. Jail, No. 1:18-cv001376-LJO-BAM, 2019 WL 248878 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 2019)
- Owens v. Hinsley, 635 F.3d 950 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Mackey v. Price, 2020 WL 7319420 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2020)
- Coughlin v. Rogers, 130 F.3d 1348 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Simmons v. Navajo Cty., Ariz., 609 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Ewing v. City of Stockton, 588 F.3d 1218 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Jones v. Williams, 297 F.3d 930 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Taylor v. List, 880 F.2d 1040 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Starr v. Baca, 652 F.3d 1202 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Corales v. Bennett, 567 F.3d 554 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Redman v. County of San Diego, 942 F.2d 1435 (9th Cir. 1991)
- Witherow v. Paff, 52 F.3d 264 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Thornburgh v. Abbott, 490 U.S. 401 (1989)
- Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78 (1987)
- Crofton v. Roe, 170 F.3d 957 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Davis v. Goord, 320 F.3d 346 (2d Cir. 2003)
- Hayes v. Idaho Corr. Ctr., 849 F.3d 1204 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539 (1974)
- McElyea v. Babbitt, 833 F.2d 196 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Hartmann v. California Dep't of Corr. & Rehab., 707 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2013)
- O'Lone v. Estate of Shabazz, 482 U.S. 342 (1987)
- Jones v. Williams, 791 F.3d 1023 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Shakur v. Schriro, 514 F.3d 878 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Malik v. Brown, 16 F.3d 330 (9th Cir. 1994)
- Keenan v. Hall, 83 F.3d 1083 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Johnson v. California, 207 F.3d 650 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Jones v. Blanas, 393 F.3d 918 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520 (1979)
- Castro v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 833 F.3d 1060 (9th Cir. 2016)

- *Kingsley v. Hendrickson*, 576 U.S. 389 (2015)
- *City of Cleburne, Tex. v. Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432 (1985)
- *Comm. Concerning Cmty. Improvement v. City of Modesto*, 583 F.3d 690 (9th Cir. 2009)
- *Serrano v. Francis*, 345 F.3d 1071 (9th Cir. 2003)
- *Engquist v. Oregon Dep't of Agr.*, 553 U.S. 591 (2008)
- *Village of Willowbrook v. Olech*, 528 U.S. 562 (2000)
- *Lazy Y Ranch Ltd. v. Behrens*, 546 F.3d 580 (9th Cir. 2008)
- *Nible v. Fink*, 828 Fed. Appx. 463 (9th Cir. 2020)
- *Nurre v. Whitehead*, 580 F.3d 1087 (9th Cir. 2009)
- *Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir. 2007)
- *Johnson v. Moore*, 948 F.2d 517 (9th Cir. 1991)
- *Thompson v. Hous. Auth.*, 782 F.2d 829 (9th Cir. 1986)
- *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52 (9th Cir. 1995)
- *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258 (9th Cir. 1992)
- *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421 (9th Cir. 1985)
- *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439 (9th Cir. 1988)
- *Anderson v. Air W.*, 542 F.2d 522 (9th Cir. 1976)
- *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639 (9th Cir. 2002)
- *In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation*, 460 F.3d 1217 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834 (9th Cir. 2014)
- *Mangiaracina v. Penzone*, 849 F.3d 1191 (9th Cir. 2017)
- *Pierce v. Cty. of Orange*, 526 F.3d 1190 (9th Cir. 2008)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
 CALIFORNIA 10 11 RYAN JOEL HOPSON, Case No. 1:24-cv-00474-BAM (PC) 12 Plaintiff,
 ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO RANDOMLY ASSIGN DISTRICT JUDGE TO
 13 v. ACTION 14 CHAVEZ, et al., FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS
 ACTION, WITH PREJUDICE, FOR 15 Defendants. FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM, FAILURE
 TO OBEY A COURT ORDER, AND 16 FAILURE TO PROSECUTE 17 (ECF No. 10) 18
 FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE 19 20 I. Background 21 Plaintiff Ryan Joel Hopson
 (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner and former county jail inmate 22 proceeding pro se and in forma
 pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

23 On November 18, 2025, the Court screened the complaint and found that it failed to 24 comply
 with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8, 18, and 20 and failed to state a cognizable claim 25 for
 relief. (ECF No. 10.)

The Court issued an order granting Plaintiff leave to file a first 26 amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal within thirty (30) days. (Id.) The Court 27 expressly warned Plaintiff that the failure to comply with the Court's order would result in a 28 recommendation for dismissal of this action, with prejudice, for failure to obey a court order and 1 for failure to state a claim.

(Id.) Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint or otherwise 2 communicate with the Court, and the deadline to do so has expired. 3 II. Failure to State a Claim 4 A. Screening Requirement and Standard 5 The Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a 6 governmental entity and/or against an officer or employee of a governmental entity.

28 U.S.C. 7 § 1915A(a). Plaintiff's complaint, or any portion thereof, is subject to dismissal if it is frivolous 8 or malicious, if it fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or if it seeks monetary 9 relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b). 10 A complaint must contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the 11 pleader is entitled to relief...." Fed.

R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Detailed factual allegations are not 12 required, but "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere 13 conclusory statements, do not suffice." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citing *Bell 14 Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). While a plaintiff's allegations are taken as 15 true, courts "are not required to indulge unwarranted inferences." *Doe I v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 16 572 F.3d 677, 681 (9th Cir.

2009) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). 17 To survive screening, Plaintiff's claims must be facially plausible, which requires 18 sufficient factual detail to allow the Court to reasonably infer that each named defendant is liable 19 for the misconduct alleged. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quotation marks omitted); *Moss v. U.S. Secret 20 Serv.*, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir.

2009). The sheer possibility that a defendant acted unlawfully 21 is not sufficient, and mere consistency with liability falls short of satisfying the plausibility 22 standard. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quotation marks omitted); *Moss*, 572 F.3d at 969. 23 B. Plaintiff's Allegations 24 Plaintiff is currently housed at the California Correctional Institution in Tehachapi, 25 California.

Plaintiff alleges the events in the complaint occurred while he was a county jail 26 inmate¹ housed at the Kings County Jail in Hanford, California. Plaintiff names as defendants: 27 1 Plaintiff has not stated whether he was a pretrial detainee or a convicted prisoner at the time of the events in the complaint.

In an abundance of caution, the Court has provided the legal standards applicable to pretrial detainees, 28 where applicable. In any amended complaint, Plaintiff should clearly state whether he was a pretrial detainee or a 1 (1) Sergeant G. Chavez; (2) Commander Thomas; (3) Corporal Calderon; (4) Kings County Jail; 2 (5) Kings County Sheriff Department; and (6) Miss Cling DT96.

3 In the complaint, which is twenty-nine pages in length, Plaintiff alleges a laundry list of 4 violations of his constitutional rights, including delays in receiving mail, improper processing of 5 legal mail, unsanitary conditions of confinement, delays in returning laundry, malfunctioning 6 phones and visitor monitors, delays and financial barriers to accessing tablets, lack of consistent 7 religious services, missing and inadequate food, disciplinary actions related to dimming cell lights 8 that cause Plaintiff to experience migraines, and discrimination on the basis of race.

9 Plaintiff requests injunctive relief and money damages. 10 C. Discussion 11 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 12 Pursuant to Rule 8, a complaint must contain “a short and plain statement of the claim 13 showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Detailed factual allegations 14 are not required, but “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere 15 conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citation omitted).

Plaintiff must 16 set forth “sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on 17 its face.’” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). While factual allegations 18 are accepted as true, legal conclusions are not. *Id.*; see also *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556–57; *Moss*, 19 572 F.3d at 969. 20 Plaintiff’s complaint is not short, and while it identifies the specific claims, the allegations 21 are conclusory as to who was involved.

22 Linkage Requirement 23 The Civil Rights Act under which this action was filed provides: 24 Every person who, under color of [state law]... subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States... to the deprivation of any rights, 25 privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution... shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for 26 redress.

27 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The statute plainly requires that there be an actual connection or link between 28 convicted prisoner during the events in the complaint. 1 the actions of the defendants and the deprivation alleged to have been suffered by Plaintiff. See 2 *Monell v. Dep’t of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978); *Rizzo v. Goode*, 423 U.S. 362 (1976).

The 3 Ninth Circuit has held that “[a] person ‘subjects another to the deprivation of a constitutional 4 right, within the meaning of section 1983, if he does an affirmative act, participates in another’s 5 affirmative acts or omits to perform an act which he is legally required to do that causes the 6 deprivation of which complaint is made.” *Johnson v. Duffy*, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir.

1978). 7 Here, Plaintiff’s complaint fails to link much of the alleged wrongful conduct to any 8 defendant. 9 Local Law Enforcement Defendant 10 Plaintiff names the Kings County Jail as a defendant. 11 “To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the plaintiff must allege two elements: (1) that a 12 right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated; and (2) that

the 13 alleged violation was committed by a person acting under color of state law.” *Campbell v. 14 Washington Dep’t of Soc.*

Servs., 671 F.3d 837, 842 n.5 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing *Ketchum v. 15 Alameda Cty.*, 811 F.2d 1243, 1245 (9th Cir. 1987)). 16 The Kings County Jail is not a proper defendant. See *Powell v. Cook Cty. Jail*, 814 F. 17 Supp. 757, 758 (N.D. Ill. 1993) (“Section 1983 imposes liability on any ‘person’ who violates 18 someone’s constitutional rights ‘under color of law.’ Cook County Jail is not a ‘person.’”); *Shaw 19 v. Fresno Cnty.*

Jail, No. 1:18-cv001376-LJO-BAM, 2019 WL 248878, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 20 2019). 21 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 18 and 20 22 Plaintiff may not bring unrelated claims against unrelated parties in a single action. Fed. 23 R. Civ. P. 18(a), 20(a)(2); *Owens v. Hinsley*, 635 F.3d 950, 952 (7th Cir. 2011); *Mackey v. Price*, 24 2020 WL 7319420, at *3–4 (E.D.

Cal. Dec. 11, 2020), report and recommendation adopted, 2021 25 WL 843462 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2021). Plaintiff may bring a claim against multiple defendants so 26 long as (1) the claim arises out of the same transaction or occurrence, or series of transactions and 27 occurrences, and (2) there are commons questions of law or fact. Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(2); 28 *Coughlin v. Rogers*, 130 F.3d 1348, 1351 (9th Cir.

1997). The “same transaction” requirement 1 refers to similarity in the factual background of a claim. *Id.* at 1349. Only if the defendants are 2 properly joined under Rule 20(a) will the Court review the other claims to determine if they may 3 be joined under Rule 18(a), which permits the joinder of multiple claims against the same party. 4 Plaintiff may not raise different claims against different defendants in a single action.

For 5 instance, Plaintiff may not state unrelated claims, arising on different dates, regarding delays in 6 receiving mail, inadequate food, racial discrimination, or unsanitary conditions of confinement in 7 the same action. Merely because Plaintiff was housed at Kings County Jail when the incidents 8 occurred does not make every injury or incident related.

Separate unrelated claims must be filed 9 in separate lawsuits. 10 Supervisory Liability 11 Insofar as Plaintiff is attempting to sue any defendant based solely on their supervisory 12 role, he may not do so. Liability may not be imposed on supervisory personnel for the actions or 13 omissions of their subordinates under the theory of respondeat superior. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676– 14 77; *Simmons v. Navajo Cty., Ariz.*, 609 F.3d 1011, 1020–21 (9th Cir.

2010); *Ewing v. City of 15 Stockton*, 588 F.3d 1218, 1235 (9th Cir. 2009); *Jones v. Williams*, 297 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 16 2002). 17 Supervisors may be held liable only if they “participated in or directed the violations, or 18 knew of the violations and failed to act to prevent them.” *Taylor v. List*, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th 19 Cir. 1989); accord *Starr v. Baca*, 652 F.3d 1202, 1205–06 (9th Cir.

2011); *Corales v. Bennett*, 205 F.3d 554, 570 (9th Cir. 2009). Supervisory liability may also exist without any personal participation if the official implemented “a policy so deficient that the policy itself is a repudiation of the constitutional rights and is the moving force of the constitutional violation.” *Redman v. County of San Diego*, 942 F.2d 1435, 1446 (9th Cir.

1991) (citations and quotations marks omitted), abrogated on other grounds by *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 114 S.Ct. 1970, 128 L.Ed.2d 811 (1990). Here, Plaintiff has failed to establish that any supervisory defendant participated in or directed any constitutional violation or that they implemented a policy so deficient that it was the moving force of any constitutional violation.

1 First Amendment 2 1. Outgoing Mail 3 Generally, prisoners have “a First Amendment right to send and receive mail.” *Witherow v. Paff*, 52 F.3d 264, 265 (9th Cir. 1995). However, there must be a “delicate balance” between prisoners’ First Amendment rights and the discretion given to prison administrators to govern the order and security of the prison.

Thornburgh v. Abbott, 490 U.S. 401, 407-08 (1989). A prison may adopt regulations or practices for incoming mail which impinge on prisoners’ First Amendment rights as long as the regulations are “reasonably related to legitimate penological interests.” *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 688, 89 (1987). Nonetheless, isolated incidents of mail interference or tampering will not support a claim under section 1983 for violation of plaintiff’s constitutional rights.

See *Crofton v. Roe*, 170 F.3d 957, 961 (9th Cir. 1999) (temporary delay or isolated incident of delay of mail does not violate a prisoner’s First Amendment rights); see also *Davis v. Goord*, 320 F.3d 346, 351 (2d Cir. 2003) (isolated incident of mail tampering usually insufficient to state claim). 2. Legal Mail 4 “[P]risoners have a protected First Amendment interest in having properly marked legal mail opened only in their presence.” *Hayes v. Idaho Corr.*

Ctr., 849 F.3d 1204, 1211 (9th Cir. 2017) (concluding the protected First Amendment interest extends to civil legal mail). Consistent with the First Amendment, prison officials may (1) require that mail from attorneys be identified as such and (2) open such correspondence in the presence of the prisoner for visual inspection. 5 See *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 576–77 (1974).

22 3. Religion 23 Incarcerated persons do not forfeit the right to the free exercise of religion, which is guaranteed by the First Amendment. See *McElyea v. Babbitt*, 833 F.2d 196, 197 (9th Cir. 1987); *Hartmann v. California Dep’t of Corr. & Rehab.*, 707 F.3d 1114, 1122-23 (9th Cir. 2013). 24 2 The legal standards applicable to First Amendment claims are the same for prisoners and pretrial detainees, so long as the conditions applied to detainees do not amount to punishment.

See, e.g., *Mangiaracina v. Penzone*, 849 F.3d 1191, 1197 (9th Cir. 2017) (applying *Turner* to First Amendment challenge of mail policy brought by pretrial detainees); *Pierce v. Cty. of Orange*,

526 F.3d 1190, 1209-13 (9th Cir. 2008) (applying *Turner* to First Amendment challenge brought by pretrial detainees). 1 To state a claim under the Free Exercise Clause, an inmate must plausibly allege that a 2 prison official's actions (a) "substantially burden[ed]" the inmate's exercise of a sincerely-held 3 religious belief; and (b) did so in an unreasonable manner—i.e., the official's actions were not 4 "rationally related to legitimate penological interests." See *O'Lone v. Estate of Shabazz*, 482 U.S. 5 342, 348-50 (1987); *Jones v. Williams*, 791 F.3d 1023, 1031, 1033 (9th Cir.

2015); *Shakur v. Schriro*, 514 F.3d 878, 884–85 (9th Cir. 2008). A substantial burden places more than an 7 inconvenience on religious exercise; it must have a tendency to coerce individuals into acting 8 contrary to their religious beliefs or exert substantial pressure on an adherent to modify his 9 behavior and to violate his beliefs. *Jones*, 791 F.3d at 1031–32.

Plaintiff must demonstrate that 10 prison officials prevented him from engaging in conduct which he sincerely believes is required 11 by his faith. *Shakur*, 514 F.3d at 884–85. The underlying religious belief must be "sincerely 12 held." *Malik v. Brown*, 16 F.3d 330, 333 (9th Cir. 1994); see also *Shakur*, 514 F.3d at 884–85 13 (noting that the "sincerity test," not the "centrality test," applies to a free exercise analysis).

14 4. Phone Calls 15 "Prisoners have a First Amendment right to telephone access, subject to reasonable 16 security limitations." *Keenan v. Hall*, 83 F.3d 1083, 1092 (9th Cir. 1996) (citing *Strandberg v. City of Helena*, 791 F.2d 744, 747 (9th Cir. 1986)), amended by 135 F.3d 1318 (9th Cir. 18 1998); see also *Johnson v. California*, 207 F.3d 650, 656 (9th Cir.

2000) (per curiam) (concluding 19 no right to a specific phone rate). If the limitations on access are reasonable, there is no First 20 Amendment violation. *Johnson v. Galli*, 596 F. Supp. 135, 138 (D. Nev. 1984). 21 Fourteenth Amendment 22 1. Conditions of Confinement 23 "[P]re-adjudication detainees retain greater liberty protections than convicted ones." 24 *Jones v. Blanas*, 393 F.3d 918, 932 (9th Cir.

2004) (citations omitted). As a pretrial detainee, 25 Plaintiff is protected from conditions of confinement which amount to punishment. *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 535–36 (1979); *Simmons v. Navajo Cty., Ariz.*, 609 F.3d 1011, 1017–18 27 (9th Cir. 2010). 28 It is the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, not the Eighth Amendment, 1 which governs pretrial detainees.

Castro v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 833 F.3d 1060, 1067–68 (9th 2 Cir. 2016). In order to state a cognizable claim for unconstitutional conditions of confinement 3 related to a risk to safety or health, a plaintiff must specifically plead as follows: (1) the defendant 4 made an intentional decision with respect to the conditions under which the plaintiff was 5 confined; (2) those conditions put the plaintiff at substantial risk of suffering serious harm; (3) the 6 defendant did not

take reasonable measures to abate that risk, even though a reasonable officer in 7 the circumstances would have appreciated the high degree of risk involved—making the 8 consequences of the defendant’s conduct obvious; and (4) by not taking such measures, the 9 defendant caused the plaintiff’s injuries.

Castro, 833 F.3d at 1071. With respect to the third 10 element, the defendant’s conduct must be “objectively unreasonable.” *Id.* (citing *Kingsley v. 11 Hendrickson*, 576 U.S. 389 (2015)). 12 2. Equal Protection 13 The Equal Protection Clause requires that persons who are similarly situated be treated 14 alike. *City of Cleburne, Tex. v. Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432, 439, (1985); *Shakur v. 15 Schriro*, 514 F.3d 878, 891 (9th Cir.

2008). An equal protection claim may be established by 16 showing that defendants intentionally discriminated against a plaintiff based on his membership 17 in a protected class, *Comm. Concerning Cmty. Improvement v. City of Modesto*, 583 F.3d 690, 18 702– 03 (9th Cir. 2009); *Serrano v. Francis*, 345 F.3d 1071, 1082 (9th Cir. 2003), or that 19 similarly situated individuals were intentionally treated differently without a rational relationship 20 to a legitimate state purpose, *Engquist v. Oregon Dep’t of Agr.*, 553 U.S. 591, 601–02 (2008); 21 *Village of Willowbrook v. Olech*, 528 U.S. 562, 564 (2000); *Lazy Y Ranch Ltd. v. Behrens*, 546 22 F.3d 580, 592 (9th Cir.

2008). 23 Prison Regulations and Policies 24 To the extent that any Defendant has not complied with applicable state statutes or prison 25 regulations, these deprivations do not support a claim under § 1983. Section 1983 only provides 26 a cause of action for the deprivation of federally protected rights. See, e.g., *Nible v. Fink*, 828 27 Fed. Appx. 463 (9th Cir.

2020) (violations of Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations do 28 not create private right of action); *Nurre v. Whitehead*, 580 F.3d 1087, 1092 (9th Cir. 2009) 1 (section 1983 claims must be premised on violation of federal constitutional right); *Prock v. 2 Warden*, No. 1:13-cv-01572-MJS (PC), 2013 WL 5553349, at *11–12 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2013) 3 (noting that several district courts have found no implied private right of action under title 15 and 4 stating that “no § 1983 claim arises for [violations of title 15] even if they occurred.”); *Parra v. 5 Hernandez*, No. 08cv0191-H (CAB), 2009 WL 3818376, at *3 (S.D.

Cal. Nov. 13, 2009) 6 (granting motion to dismiss prisoner’s claims brought pursuant to Title 15 of the California Code 7 of Regulations); *Chappell v. Newbarth*, No. 1:06-cv-01378-OWW-WMW (PC), 2009 WL 8 1211372, at *9 (E.D. Cal. May 1, 2009) (holding that there is no private right of action under 9 Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations); *Tirado v. Santiago*, No. 1:22-CV-00724 BAM 10 PC, 2022 WL 4586294, at *5 (E.D.

Cal. Sept. 29, 2022), report and recommendation adopted, 11 No. 1:22-CV-00724 JLT BAM PC, 2022 WL 16748838 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2022) (same). 12 Injunctive Relief 13 Insofar as Plaintiff

seeks injunctive relief, any such request is now moot. Plaintiff is no longer housed at the Kings County Jail, where he alleges the incidents at issue occurred. Therefore, any injunctive relief he seeks against the officials at the Kings County Jail is moot.

See *Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493 F.3d 1047, 1053 n.5 (9th Cir. 2007) (prisoner's claims for injunctive relief generally become moot upon transfer) (citing *Johnson v. Moore*, 948 F.2d 517, 519 (9th Cir. 1991) (per curiam) (holding claims for injunctive relief "relating to [a prison's] policies are moot" when the prisoner has been moved and "he has demonstrated no reasonable expectation of returning to [the prison]")).

Furthermore, any award of equitable relief is governed by the Prison Litigation Reform Act, which provides in relevant part, "Prospective relief in any civil action with respect to prison conditions shall extend no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right of a particular plaintiff or plaintiffs.

The court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right." 18 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(1)(A). III. Failure to Prosecute and Failure to Obey a Court Order 2 A. Legal Standard 3 Local Rule 110 provides that "[f]ailure... of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions...

5 within the inherent power of the Court." District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate,... dismissal." *Thompson v. Hous. Auth.*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.

See, e.g., *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 11 F.3d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130–33 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order).

14 In determining whether to dismiss an action, the Court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions.

Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988). B. Discussion Here, Plaintiff's first amended complaint is overdue, and he has failed to comply with the Court's order.

The Court cannot effectively manage its docket if Plaintiff ceases litigating his 22 case. Thus, the Court finds that both the first and second factors weigh in favor of dismissal. 23 The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendant, also weighs in favor of dismissal, since a 24 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an action.

25 *Anderson v. Air W.*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor usually weighs against 26 dismissal because public policy favors disposition on the merits. *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 27 639, 643 (9th Cir. 2002).

However, “this factor lends little support to a party whose 28 responsibility it is to move a case toward disposition on the merits but whose conduct impedes 1 progress in that direction,” which is the case here. In *re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products 2 Liability Litigation*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1228 (9th Cir. 2006) (citation omitted). 3 Finally, the Court’s warning to a party that failure to obey the court’s order will result in 4 dismissal satisfies the “considerations of the alternatives” requirement.

Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262; 5 *Malone*, 833 at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court’s November 18, 2025 6 screening order expressly warned Plaintiff that his failure to file an amended complaint would 7 result in a recommendation of dismissal of this action, with prejudice, for failure to obey a court 8 order and for failure to state a claim. (ECF No. 10.)

Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that 9 dismissal could result from his noncompliance. 10 Additionally, at this stage in the proceedings there is little available to the Court that 11 would constitute a satisfactory lesser sanction while protecting the Court from further 12 unnecessary expenditure of its scarce resources.

As Plaintiff is proceeding in forma pauperis in 13 this action, it appears that monetary sanctions will be of little use and the preclusion of evidence 14 or witnesses is likely to have no effect given that Plaintiff has ceased litigating his case. 15 IV. Conclusion and Recommendation 16 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the Clerk of the Court to randomly assign a 17 District Judge to this action.

18 Furthermore, the Court finds that dismissal is the appropriate sanction and HEREBY 19 RECOMMENDS that this action be dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state a claim 20 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, for failure to obey a court order, and for Plaintiff’s failure to 21 prosecute this action. 22 These Findings and Recommendation will be submitted to the United States District Judge 23 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (l).

Within fourteen 24 (14) days after being served with these Findings and Recommendation, the parties may file 25 written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate 26 Judge’s Findings and Recommendation.” Objections, if any, shall not

exceed fifteen (15) pages 27 or include exhibits. Exhibits may be referenced by document and page number if already in 28 the record before the Court.

Any pages filed in excess of the 15-page limit may not be 1 considered. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may 2 result in the waiver of the “right to challenge the magistrate’s factual findings” on 3 appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838–39 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 4 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir.

1991)). 5 IT IS SO ORDERED. 6 7 Dated: January 5, 2026 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe _ UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28