

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Antonio Rodriguez v. Solano State Prison, et al.

Rodriguez v. Solano State Prison · No. 2:21-cv-00622 KJM SCR P · Decided September 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The document is a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs. It recommends granting the remaining defendant’s motion for summary judgment because the claim was filed outside California’s applicable limitations period and the plaintiff failed to establish statutory or equitable tolling based on mental illness. The court also grants the defendant’s request for judicial notice of incarceration records.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sean C. Riordan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 17, 2025
DOCKET	2:21-cv-00622 KJM SCR P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Findings and recommendations by a United States magistrate judge on the sole remaining defendant's converted motion for summary judgment in a prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is proper when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The moving party bears the initial burden; if the nonmoving party bears the trial burden, the movant may show an absence of evidence supporting an essential element. The opposing party must identify specific admissible evidence showing a genuine, material dispute, and reasonable inferences are drawn in that party's favor.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Antonio Rodriguez v. Solano State Prison, et al.

TOPICS

prisoners rights

section 1983

statute of limitations

summary judgment

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

civil procedure

statute of limitations

summary judgment

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 deliberate-indifference claim was barred by the applicable statute of limitations.
2. Whether plaintiff established statutory tolling under California Code of Civil Procedure § 352(a) based on alleged mental incapacity.
3. Whether plaintiff established equitable tolling under California law.
4. Whether summary judgment was appropriate on the statute-of-limitations issue.

HOLDINGS

1. The claim was subject to California's two-year personal-injury limitations period, plus up to two years of statutory prisoner tolling under California Code of Civil Procedure § 352.1(a), for a potential four-year limitations period.
2. Plaintiff failed to establish a triable issue that he lacked the legal capacity to make decisions within the meaning of California Code of Civil Procedure § 352(a), and mental-health treatment or placement alone did not establish incapacity.
3. Plaintiff failed to establish equitable tolling under California law because he presented no evidence that he pursued a remedy in another forum or otherwise attempted to resolve the dispute before filing suit.
4. The magistrate judge recommended granting defendant Sabati's motion for summary judgment because plaintiff's claim was filed nearly twelve years after accrual and plaintiff failed to establish statutory or equitable tolling.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Summary judgment is appropriate when there “is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.”” (at 6)

“Under federal law, a claim accrues when the plaintiff knows or has reason to know of the injury which is the basis of the action.” (at 7)

“The fact of some mental impairment does not, by itself, warrant tolling under § 352(a).” (at 8)

“It is undisputed that plaintiff’s claim, filed nearly twelve years after accrual, is barred by the statute of limitations.” (at 11)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleges that while he was on suicide watch and housed in administrative segregation at California State Prison, Solano, defendant nurse N. Sabati delivered two bags containing large quantities of Benadryl and Abilify instead of the single-pill dosage prescribed for him. Plaintiff was later found unresponsive and showing signs of overdose, requiring treatment at an outside hospital. He filed suit nearly twelve years after the alleged December 2008 incident and argued that mental illness and mental-health housing tolled the limitations period.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an original complaint in the Northern District of California on December 17, 2020; the action was transferred to the Eastern District of California in 2021. Plaintiff's second amended complaint alleged Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims against five defendants, but screening found cognizable claims only against defendants Sabati and Coder. Coder was dismissed without prejudice after the U.S. Marshal Service could not locate her. Sabati moved to dismiss the remaining claim as untimely under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6); after plaintiff relied on evidence concerning equitable tolling, the magistrate judge converted the motion to summary judgment, issued a Rand notice, and recommended granting the motion and closing the case.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was ordered. The magistrate judge recommended that the district judge grant defendant's motion for summary judgment and direct the Clerk of Court to close the case. The parties were advised that objections could be filed within fourteen days under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

CASES CITED

- In re Oracle Corp. Sec. Litig., 627 F.3d 376, 387 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-25 (1986)
- Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 586-87 (1986)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248, 255 (1986)
- T.W. Elec. Serv., Inc. v. Pac. Elec. Contractors Ass'n, 809 F.2d 626, 630 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Richards v. Nielsen Freight Lines, 602 F. Supp. 1224, 1244-45 (E.D. Cal. 1985), aff'd, 810 F.2d 898, 902 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Jones v. Blanas, 393 F.3d 918, 927-28 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Azer v. Connell, 306 F.3d 930, 935-36 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Butler v. Nat'l Cmty. Renaissance of Cal., 766 F.3d 1191, 1198 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Johnson v. State of Cal., 207 F.3d 650, 654 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Cato v. Darst, No. 2:17-cv-1873 TLN EFB P, 2019 WL 2249636, at *2 (E.D. Cal. May 23, 2019)
- Wallace v. Kato, 549 U.S. 384, 388 (2007)
- TwoRivers v. Lewis, 174 F.3d 987, 991 (9th Cir. 1999)

- *Sain v. City of Bend*, 309 F.3d 1134, 1138 (9th Cir. 2002)
- *Cervantes v. City of San Diego*, 5 F.3d 1273, 1275-77 (9th Cir. 1993)
- *United States v. Marolf*, 173 F.3d 1213, 1218 n.3 (9th Cir. 1999)
- *Estate of Stern v. Tuscan Retreat, Inc.*, 725 F. App'x 518, 521-22 (9th Cir. 2018)
- *Feeley v. S. Pac. Transp. Co.*, 285 Cal. Rptr. 666, 667 (Cal. Ct. App. 1991)
- *Lang v. Sacramento Sheriff Dep't*, No. 2:14-CV-0777 EFB P, 2017 WL 1093838, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2017)
- *Alcott Rehab. Hosp. v. Superior Court*, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 807, 812 (Cal. Ct. App. 2001)
- *Hsu v. Mt. Zion Hosp.*, 66 Cal. Rptr. 659, 666 (Cal. Ct. App. 1968)
- *Gutierrez v. Butler*, No. S-06-2684 LKK EFB P, 2008 WL 436948, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 14, 2008)
- *Zuniga v. Bank of Am. N.A.*, No. CV 14-6471 MWF, 2014 WL 7156403, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2014)
- *Jackson v. Ebrahim*, No. CV 23-10700 GW KSX, 2025 WL 1720172, at *6 (C.D. Cal. May 14, 2025)
- *Lantzy v. Centex Homes*, 31 Cal. 4th 363, 370 (2003)
- *Daviton v. Columbia/HCA Healthcare Corp.*, 241 F.3d 1131, 1137, 1140 (9th Cir. 2001) (en banc)
- *Fink v. Shedler*, 192 F.3d 911, 916 (9th Cir. 1999)
- *Mitchell v. Snowden*, No. 2:15-CV-1167 TLN AC P, 2019 WL 2285324, at *9 (E.D. Cal. May 29, 2019)
- *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)
- *Pacheco v. Diaz*, No. 1:19-cv-0774 SAB PC, 2019 WL 5073594, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 4, 2019)