

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished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)