

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Broadnax v. State Controller's Office, et al.

Broadnax · No. 1:25-cv-00285-SAB (PC) · Decided July 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The document is a magistrate judge’s order directing random assignment of a district judge and findings and recommendation in a prisoner civil-rights action. It recommends dismissal without leave to amend because the plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim concerning deductions from his prison trust account and handling of related grievances.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley A. Boone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	July 24, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00285-SAB (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, screened under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A and 1915(e)(2)(B); magistrate judge issued findings and recommendation that the action be dismissed without leave to amend for failure to state a cognizable claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The complaint was screened under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A and 1915(e)(2)(B). The court accepted the allegations as true for screening purposes and applied the Rule 8(a)(2) and plausibility standards, construing the pro se pleading liberally.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Cottrell L. Broadnax v. State Controller's Office, et al.

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- procedural due process
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff stated a procedural due process claim under § 1983 based on deductions from his prison trust account for filing, postage, and mailing fees.
2. Whether the handling, denial, or screening of plaintiff's prison grievances stated a constitutional claim under § 1983.
3. Whether dismissal without leave to amend was appropriate because amendment would be futile.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff could not state a § 1983 procedural due process claim for the alleged unauthorized deductions because California provides an adequate post-deprivation remedy for the loss of property.
2. Allegations that prison officials denied, screened out, ignored, or inadequately responded to grievances, without more, did not state a claim under § 1983.
3. Dismissal without leave to amend was recommended because plaintiff could not state a claim as a matter of law and amendment would be futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“As adequate state law procedures existed to address the alleged loss, Plaintiff cannot state a due process claim against Defendants.” (at 3-4)

“Further, to the extent Plaintiff challenges how his grievances regarding this matter were handled, he cannot state a valid claim under § 1983 either.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that funds were withdrawn from his prison trust account to pay filing fees for cases he filed in the Eastern District of California, as well as postage and mailing fees. He also appeared to challenge the handling of grievances concerning those deductions. The court treated the allegations as challenging unauthorized deprivation of property and concluded that California provided an adequate post-deprivation remedy.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on February 7, 2025, in the Northern District of California. The action was transferred to the Eastern District of California on March 5, 2025, and plaintiff was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis on May 8, 2025. The magistrate judge ordered random assignment of a district judge and recommended dismissal without leave to amend.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)
- Jones v. Williams, 297 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Wilhelm v. Rotman, 680 F.3d 1113, 1121 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Moss v. U.S. Secret Service, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Shinault v. Hawks, 782 F.3d 1053, 1057 (9th Cir. 2015) (as amended)
- Quick v. Jones, 754 F.2d 1521, 1523 (9th Cir. 1985)
- Hudson v. Palmer, 468 U.S. 517, 533 (1984)
- Zinerman v. Burch, 494 U.S. 113, 129-32 (1990)
- King v. Massarweh, 782 F.2d 825, 826 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Willoughby v. Luster, 717 F. Supp. 1439, 1443 (D. Nev. 1989)
- Barnett v. Centoni, 31 F.3d 813, 816-17 (9th Cir. 1994) (per curiam)
- Stribling v. Wilson, 770 F. App'x 829, 830 (9th Cir. 2019)
- Hupp v. County of San Diego, ED CV 14-576-VAP (SP), 2016 WL 11758807, at *8 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2016), accepted by 2016 WL 11759108 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2016)
- Dennison v. Ryan, 522 F. App'x 414, 417-18 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Roberts v. Lynch, No. 2:20-cv-01349 WBS DB P, 2022 WL 196531, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2022)
- Jordan v. Diaz, No. 5:20-cv-00574-MWF-JC, 2020 WL 5167738, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 2020)
- Ramirez v. Galaza, 334 F.3d 850, 860 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Malone v. Jones, No. 1:09-cv-01397 JLT (PC), 2010 WL 4394086, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2010)
- Evans v. Skolnik, 637 F. App'x 285, 288 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Towner v. Knowles, No. CIV S-08-2823 LKK EFB P, 2009 WL 4281999, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2009)
- Rosati v. Igbino, 791 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Akhtar v. Mesa, 698 F.3d 1202, 1212-13 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., 656 F.3d 1034, 1041 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)