

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON,
EUGENE DIVISION

T.F. v. State of Oregon, et al.

T.F. · No. 6:25-cv-2166-MC · Decided April 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon denied defendants’ Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss T.F.’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims arising from alleged sexual abuse while plaintiff was in Oregon Youth Authority custody. The court held that, at the pleading stage, the claims were plausibly timely because plaintiff allegedly did not understand the examinations to constitute abuse or recognize defendants’ role until later news reports. The court also held that allegations concerning OYA’s awareness of abuse reports and failure to investigate or implement protective policies plausibly supported supervisory liability.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon, Eugene Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael J. McShane
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon, Eugene Division
DECIDED	April 14, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-2166-MC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims as untimely and insufficiently pleaded.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, draws reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's favor, and determines whether the complaint states a facially plausible claim. A limitations defense may be resolved at the pleading stage only when untimeliness is apparent on the face of the complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion; precedential status unknown

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

statute of limitations

section 1983

civil rights

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

constitutional law

civil procedure

statute of limitations

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims were time-barred on the face of the First Amended Complaint.
2. Whether Plaintiff plausibly alleged supervisory liability against the individual OYA defendants based on their knowledge of and deliberate indifference to Dr. Edwards's abuse and OYA's failure to investigate and prevent abuse.

HOLDINGS

1. The claims could not be dismissed as untimely under Rule 12(b)(6) because the complaint plausibly alleged that Plaintiff did not discover his constitutional injury and the individual defendants' role in causing it until the 2025 reports, and the running of the limitations period was not apparent on the face of the complaint.
2. Plaintiff plausibly stated § 1983 claims against the individual defendants by alleging their personal culpable inaction, including knowledge of repeated abuse reports and systemic failures to investigate and prevent abuse, and a sufficient causal connection between that inaction and the alleged constitutional injury.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Plaintiff’s injury would, accordingly, accrue only when he knew or should have known not only of the abuse itself, but the individual Defendants’ roles in knowing about the risks but turning a blind eye to Dr. Edwards’s actions.” (Discussion I)

“The requisite causal connection can be established by setting in motion a series of acts by others, or by knowingly refusing to terminate a series of acts by others, which the supervisor knew or reasonably should have known would cause others to inflict a constitutional injury.” (Discussion II)

“Plaintiff pleads facts sufficient to plausibly show that his 1983 claims are timely and that the individual Defendants are liable.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In 2003, when Plaintiff was 17, he was committed to the Oregon Youth Authority and received several examinations from Dr. Edwards at MacLaren Youth Correctional Facility. Plaintiff alleges that Dr. Edwards fondled his genitals during the examinations, that he filed some grievances, and that he did not understand the conduct to be sexual abuse until 2025 news reports revealed allegations of Dr. Edwards's abuse and alleged OYA cover-ups. Plaintiff further alleged that OYA officials knew or should have known of Dr. Edwards's predatory conduct and of broader failures to investigate and prevent abuse of youth in custody.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint alleging that, while he was a minor in Oregon Youth Authority custody, a physician sexually abused him and OYA officials failed to prevent or investigate the abuse. Defendants moved to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6). The court denied the motion, holding that the claims were plausibly timely and adequately pleaded.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Burget v. Lokelani Bernice Pauahi Bishop Trust, 200 F.3d 661, 663 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Jones v. Blanas, 393 F.3d 918, 927 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Bonneau v. Centennial Sch. Dist. No. 28J, 666 F.3d 577, 580-81 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Lukovsky v. City & Cnty. of S.F., 535 F.3d 1044, 1049 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Ward v. Westinghouse Can., Inc., 32 F.3d 1405, 1407 (9th Cir. 1994)
- St. Clair v. Cnty. of Okanogan, 154 F.4th 1154, 1156-60 (2025)
- Simmons v. United States, 805 F.2d 1363 (9th Cir. 1986)
- U.S. ex rel. Air Control Techs., Inc. v. Pre Con Indus., Inc., 720 F.3d 1174, 1178 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Von Saher v. Norton Simon Museum of Art at Pasadena, 592 F.3d 954, 969 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Syed v. M-I, LLC, 853 F.3d 492, 499 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Doe v. Reese, No. 3:24-CV-02011-AB, 2026 WL 125380, at *3 (D. Or. Jan. 16, 2026)
- Doe v. County of Josephine, 2015 WL 2412181, at *2 (D. Or. 2015)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 663, 676, 678-79 (2009)
- Nayab v. Cap. One Bank (USA), N.A., 942 F.3d 480, 496 (9th Cir. 2019)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 556, 570 (2007)
- Keates v. Koile, 883 F.3d 1228, 1242-43 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Starr v. Baca, 652 F.3d 1202, 1204-08 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Dubner v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco, 266 F.3d 959, 968 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Usher v. City of Los Angeles, 828 F.2d 556, 561 (9th Cir. 1987)