

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Jane Doe v. Mountain View Hospital, LLC; Idaho Falls Community Hospital, LLC

Doe · No. 4:24-cv-00360-DKG · Decided March 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Idaho addresses Plaintiff Jane Doe’s motion for leave to amend and for reconsideration, along with former defendants Brandon Bloxham and Justin Thompson’s motion to intervene. The court grants limited intervention for purposes of opposing the amendment and reconsideration motions, but denies Plaintiff’s motion to amend to add a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim and to reconsider dismissal of state tort claims. The court concludes that the proposed § 1983 claim is futile because the alleged conduct by the private hospital and physicians is not fairly attributable to the state.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Debora K. Grasham
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
DECIDED	March 2, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-cv-00360-DKG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for leave to file a second amended complaint adding a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim and for reconsideration of the prior dismissal of state-law tort claims. Former individual defendants moved to intervene for the limited purpose of opposing those motions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Leave to amend under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2) is discretionary and generally freely granted, but may be denied for undue delay, prejudice, bad faith, or futility. Reconsideration under Rule 59(e) requires newly discovered evidence, clear error, or an intervening change in controlling law. Intervention is evaluated under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24, with practical and equitable considerations guiding the analysis.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

PARTIES

Jane Doe v. Mountain View Hospital, LLC, Idaho Falls Community Hospital, LLC

TOPICS

motion to amend

motion for reconsideration

intervention

section 1983

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

health law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Brandon Bloxham and Justin Thompson satisfied the requirements for intervention as of right or permissive intervention under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24.
2. Whether leave to amend should be denied as futile because the proposed 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim did not plausibly allege that the defendants acted under color of state law.
3. Whether reconsideration of the dismissal of the state-law tort claims was warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).

HOLDINGS

1. Former defendants who would be directly implicated by proposed new or renewed claims may intervene for the limited purpose of opposing a motion to amend and a motion for reconsideration when the intervention is timely, their interests are significantly protectable and may be impaired, existing parties may not adequately represent those interests, and the proposed claims share common questions of law or fact.
2. Leave to amend may be denied as futile where the proposed § 1983 claim alleges constitutional deprivations caused only by private conduct and fails to plausibly allege that the defendants acted under color of state law or that their conduct was fairly attributable to the State.
3. Reconsideration was unwarranted because Plaintiff did not establish newly discovered evidence, clear error, or an intervening change in controlling law, and the proposed § 1983 amendment was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The conduct alleged to have violated Plaintiff’s constitutional rights was not fairly attributable to any state policy.”

“Because futility is alone a proper basis for not granting leave to amend, the Court will deny the motion.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that, while employed by Mountain View Hospital and/or Idaho Falls Community Hospital, she requested medical leave and accommodations related to physical and mental health conditions. After a meeting with human-resources personnel, she was taken to Idaho Falls Community Hospital and placed on an

involuntary psychiatric hold, allegedly involving private physicians Brandon Bloxham and Justin Thompson. Plaintiff alleged that the hold and related treatment violated her constitutional rights and supported employment-related and state-law claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on August 9, 2024, asserting ADA, FMLA, IHRA, and state-law claims. The court dismissed the employment-related claims in part without prejudice and with leave to amend, and dismissed the state-law tort claims without prejudice to refiling in state court and without leave to amend. Plaintiff filed an amended complaint, then sought leave to amend again and reconsideration; former defendants Brandon Bloxham and Justin Thompson moved to intervene. The court denied amendment and reconsideration and granted limited intervention, concluding the intervenors' status ended when the order was filed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Cooper v. Newsom, 13 F.4th 857 (9th Cir. 2021)
- United States v. Idaho, 342 F.R.D. 144 (D. Idaho 2022)
- Animal Legal Def. Fund v. Otter, 300 F.R.D. 461 (D. Idaho 2014)
- Callahan v. Brookdale Senior Living Cmty., Inc., 42 F.4th 1013 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Citizens for Balanced Use v. Mont. Wilderness Ass'n, 647 F.3d 893 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Perry v. Prop. 8 Official Proponents, 587 F.3d 947 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Donnelly v. Glickman, 159 F.3d 405 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Spangler v. Pasadena City Bd. of Educ., 552 F.2d 1326 (9th Cir. 1977)
- Raymond v. Sloan, 2014 WL 4215378 (D. Idaho Aug. 25, 2014)
- Moore v. Verizon Comms. Inc., 2013 WL 450365 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 5, 2013)
- Orange County v. Air Cal., 799 F.2d 535 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Sonoma Cnty. Ass'n of Retired Employees v. Sonoma Cnty., 708 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Center for Biological Diversity v. United States Forest Service, 80 F.4th 943 (9th Cir. 2023)
- Benko v. Quality Loan Serv. Corp., 789 F.3d 1111 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Nunes v. Ashcroft, 375 F.3d 805 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Townsend v. Univ. of Alaska, 543 F.3d 478 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Hurn v. Ret. Fund Tr. of Plumbing, Heating & Piping Indus. of S. Cal., 648 F.2d 1252 (9th Cir. 1981)
- Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178 (1962)
- United States v. Webb, 655 F.2d 977 (9th Cir. 1981)
- Chudacoff v. Univ. Med. Ctr. of S. Nev., 649 F.3d 1143 (9th Cir. 2011)
- New York Life Insur. Co. v. Gunwall, 675 F.Supp.3d 1126 (W.D. Wash. 2023)

- DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton, 833 F.2d 183 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Long v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 442 F.3d 1178 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Rawson v. Recovery Innovations, Inc., 975 F.3d 742 (9th Cir. 2020)
- West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42 (1988)
- United States v. Classic, 313 U.S. 299 (1941)
- Ochoa v. Public Consulting Grp., Inc., 48 F.4th 1102 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Am. Mfrs. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan, 526 U.S. 40 (1999)
- Sutton v. Providence St. Joseph Med. Ctr., 192 F.3d 826 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Nat. Collegiate Athletic Ass’n v. Tarkanian, 488 U.S. 179 (1988)
- Price v. State of Hawai’i, 939 F.2d 702 (9th Cir. 1991)
- Webster v. Canyon View Hosp., 2022 WL 1912077 (D. Idaho June 3, 2022)
- Morrison v. Clinic, 703 F.Supp.3d 1245 (D. Mont. 2023)
- Probst v. Adams Cnty. Sheriff Dept., 2021 WL 1554064 (D. Idaho Apr. 19, 2021)
- Chudacoff v. Univ. Med. Ctr. of S. Nev., 649 F.3d 1143 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co., 457 U.S. 922 (1982)
- Children’s Health Defense v. Meta Platforms, Inc., 112 F.4th 742 (9th Cir. 2024)
- O’Handley v. Weber, 62 F.4th 1145 (9th Cir. 2023)
- Collins v. Womancare, 878 F.2d 1145 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Wright v. Serv. Employees Int’l Union Loc. 503, 48 F.4th 1112 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Brentwood Acad. v. Tenn. Secondary Sch. Athletic Ass’n, 531 U.S. 288 (2001)
- Jensen v. Lane Cnty., 222 F.3d 570 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Jackson v. Metro. Edison Co., 419 U.S. 345 (1974)
- Heineke v. Santa Clara Univ., 965 F.3d 1009 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Blum v. Yaretsky, 457 U.S. 991 (1982)
- Castillo v. Yuma Cnty. Bd. of Supervisors, 2025 WL 2879749 (D. Ariz. Oct. 9, 2025)
- Douglass v. HonorHealth, 2024 WL 4475093 (D. Ariz. Oct. 11, 2024)
- 389 Orange St. Partners v. Arnold, 179 F.3d 656 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Novak v. United States, 795 F.3d 1012 (9th Cir. 2015)