

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jonathan Christopher Coffe v. Singh, et al.

Coffe v. Singh · No. No. 2:24-cv-3247 CKD P · Decided September 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California screens a state prisoner’s second amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The court concludes that the plaintiff fails to state an Eighth Amendment claim because he identifies no injury caused by remaining on the floor and does not allege deliberate indifference by the defendant nurses. The magistrate judge recommends dismissal without leave to amend and closure of the case, while denying the motion for service of process.

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	September 9, 2025
DOCKET	No. 2:24-cv-3247 CKD P
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a state prisoner's second amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, together with consideration of plaintiff's motion for service of process.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must screen a prisoner's complaint against a governmental entity or officer and dismiss claims that are frivolous or malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. The pleading must allege a sufficiently serious injury and deliberate indifference to a substantial risk of serious harm to state an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Jonathan Christopher Coffe v. Singh, et al.

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- cruel and unusual punishment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the second amended complaint stated an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim based on defendants' alleged failure to ensure that a bed alarm was audible.
2. Whether plaintiff's motion for an order directing service of process should be granted before the complaint survived screening.
3. Whether plaintiff should receive leave to file a third amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The second amended complaint failed to state an Eighth Amendment claim because plaintiff did not identify an injury caused by remaining on the floor and did not allege facts showing that any defendant knew or should have known he would fall and remain on the floor.
2. The motion requesting an order directing service of process on defendants was denied because the complaint did not survive screening.
3. The court declined to grant leave to file a third amended complaint because plaintiff had already been given two opportunities to state a claim and further amendment appeared futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Thus, the relevant inquiry is whether prison officials, “acting with deliberate indifference, exposed a prisoner to a sufficiently substantial risk of serious damage to his future health.”” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, was admitted to San Joaquin General Hospital after becoming weak from starving himself. He fell from his bed and allegedly remained unconscious on the floor for 30 to 45 minutes after an alarm failed to notify staff because its volume was too low. Plaintiff alleged that nurse defendants failed to check the alarm volume, but he did not attribute the fall itself to defendants or identify an injury caused by remaining on the floor.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court previously dismissed his amended complaint with leave to amend. After plaintiff filed a second amended complaint, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal for failure to state a claim and denial of further leave to amend, while separately ordering assignment of a district judge and denying plaintiff's motion for service of process.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 833-34, 837 (1994)
- Connick v. Thompson, 563 U.S. 51, 61 (2011)
- Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 JONATHAN CHRISTOPHER COFFER, No. 2:24-cv-3247 CKD P 12
Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER AND 14 SINGH, et al., FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 15
Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and seeking relief pursuant to 42
U.S.C. § 18 1983.

On March 18, 2025, the court dismissed plaintiff's amended complaint with leave to file a 19
second amended complaint. Plaintiff has now filed a second amended complaint. 20 The court is
required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a 21 governmental entity
or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a).

The 22 court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are
legally 23 "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or
that seek 24 monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §
1915A(b)(1),(2). 25 Plaintiff alleges that while admitted in the San Joaquin General Hospital for
weakness 26 resulting from plaintiff starving himself, he fell from his bed and was left
unconscious on the 27 floor for 30-45 minutes.

Apparently, an alarm should have notified staff of the fall, but the 28 // 1 volume on the alarm
was turned down too low. Plaintiff blames certain defendants who are 2 nurses for not checking
the volume on the alarm before plaintiff fell. 3 As plaintiff has been already informed, conditions
of confinement can amount to cruel and 4 unusual punishment and therefore violate the Eighth
Amendment.

Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 5 825, 833 (1994). A prison official may be held liable for subjecting
an inmate to harmful 6 conditions of confinement if a prisoner can show sufficiently serious injury
and that the prison 7 official was deliberately indifferent to the risk of harm. Id. at 834, 837.

Thus, the relevant 8 inquiry is whether prison officials, "acting with deliberate indifference,
exposed a prisoner to a 9 sufficiently substantial risk of serious damage to his future health." Id. at
834 (internal quotation 10 omitted). 11 Plaintiff does not state a claim under the Eighth
Amendment for two reasons.

First, 12 plaintiff fails to point to any injury he suffered because of any actions of defendants. To
be clear, 13 plaintiff does not blame defendants for his falling, but for leaving him on the floor and

does not point to anything that reasonably suggests his remaining on the floor caused him any injury. Second, even if plaintiff did suffer actionable injury, he has not shown it was the result of deliberate indifference.

To make such a showing, plaintiff would have to point to facts indicating a defendant knew or should have known that plaintiff would fall from his bed and then be left on the floor. See *Connick v. Thompson*, 563 U.S. 51, 61 (2011) (deliberate indifference standard requires proof that a defendant disregarded a “known or obvious consequence of his action”).

This showing has not been made. For these reasons, plaintiff’s second amended complaint must be dismissed. Plaintiff has been given two opportunities to, in good faith, state a claim upon which he can proceed.

The court does not give leave to file a third amended complaint because it appears doing so is futile. In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The Clerk of the Court assign a district court judge to this case. 2. Plaintiff’s motion that the court order service of process on defendants (ECF No. 21) is DENIED. 1 IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that: 2 1.

Plaintiff’s second amended complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; and 2. This case be closed. These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court.

Such a document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). Dated: September 9, 2025 at the UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE