

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Farzad Allaf-Motedayen v. Sonoma County Child Protective
Services, et al.

Allaf-Motedayen · No. 25-cv-03050-MMC · Decided December 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismissed Farzad Allaf-Motedayen’s Third Amended Complaint without further leave to amend. The court held that the complaint did not adequately plead federal claims concerning the removal of plaintiff’s children, his arrest and alleged excessive force, or the withholding of body-worn camera footage under Brady v. Maryland. The court declined supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims and directed the Clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maxine M. Chesney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	December 2, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-03050-MMC
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	On screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the district court reviewed plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint after previously dismissing earlier versions for failure to state cognizable federal claims and granting repeated leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court screened the in forma pauperis complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), dismissing claims that were frivolous, failed to state a claim, or sought monetary relief from an immune defendant. In evaluating pleading sufficiency, the court did not accept legal conclusions couched as factual allegations as true.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; limited precedential value
PARTIES	Farzad Allaf-Motedayen v. Sonoma County Child Protective Services, et al.

TOPICS

section 1983 qualified immunity fourth amendment police misconduct civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights constitutional law civil procedure criminal procedure family law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff stated a federal claim based on the removal of his children pursuant to a protective custody warrant.
2. Whether plaintiff alleged that officers arrested him without probable cause in violation of the Fourth Amendment.
3. Whether plaintiff alleged facts showing that officers used excessive force or could not claim qualified immunity when they broke his vehicle window during the arrest.
4. Whether denial of body-worn-camera footage stated a Brady claim.
5. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims after dismissing all federal claims.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable federal claim based on removal of his children because he did not allege facts showing that the protective custody warrant was invalid.
2. Plaintiff failed to state an arrest claim because the allegations did not support a finding that officers lacked probable cause to arrest him for violating the restraining order.
3. Plaintiff failed to state an excessive-force claim based on officers breaking his vehicle window because he alleged no facts establishing circumstances comparable to those in which breaking a vehicle window and dragging a compliant suspect over broken glass constituted excessive force, and he failed to allege facts showing the officers were not entitled to qualified immunity.
4. Plaintiff failed to state a Brady claim because he alleged only conclusorily that the footage would have contradicted officer statements and supported his defenses, without alleging facts concerning the nature of the purported contradiction or prejudice to his ability to defend himself.
5. After dismissing all claims over which it had original jurisdiction, the court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's remaining state-law claims and dismissed them without prejudice to refiling in state court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For the reasons stated above, the federal claims in the TAC are hereby DISMISSED without further leave to amend, and the state law claims in the TAC are hereby DISMISSED without prejudice to plaintiff's reasserting such claims in a state court proceeding.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that a state-court protective custody warrant authorizing removal of his three children was facially invalid because it lacked a judicial case number, affidavit, and raised seal. He also alleged that officers arrested him for violating a restraining order without probable cause and broke his vehicle window during the arrest, purportedly using excessive force. Plaintiff further alleged that a police sergeant denied his request for body-worn-camera footage from the arrest, which he claimed violated *Brady v. Maryland*.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Sallie Kim dismissed the initial complaint for failure to state a cognizable claim and granted leave to amend. The First Amended Complaint was dismissed in part for failure to state a federal claim, with supplemental jurisdiction declined over the state claims, and another opportunity to amend was granted. The Second Amended Complaint was likewise dismissed as to the federal claims, with further leave to amend. After reviewing the Third Amended Complaint, the court dismissed all federal claims without further leave to amend, declined supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims, dismissed those claims without prejudice to refiling in state court, and directed the clerk to close the file.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Coles v. Eagle*, 704 F.3d 624, 630 (9th Cir. 2013)
- *Keates v. Koile*, 883 F.3d 1228, 1235 (9th Cir. 2018)
- *Holland v. Azevedo*, 2016 WL 1754446, at *8-*11 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2016)
- *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963)
- *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- *Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 n.7 (1988)