

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Collins v. Smith

No. 2:24-cv-01229 SCR P (E.D. Cal. June 10, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-01229 SCR P · Decided June 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants Bobby Lee Collins leave to proceed in forma pauperis in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The court screens the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and finds that it fails to state a claim, including under the Americans with Disabilities Act, because the allegations are largely indecipherable and do not adequately connect the medical records to the claims. The complaint is not served, and Collins is granted 30 days to file a First Amended Complaint.

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	June 11, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-01229 SCR P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of an incarcerated pro se plaintiff's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, together with consideration of the plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must dismiss a prisoner's complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. In assessing failure to state a claim, the court accepts well-pleaded allegations as true and construes them in the plaintiff's favor, but disregards naked assertions, labels, conclusions, and formulaic recitations of elements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- ada / disability
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

civil procedure

Americans with Disabilities Act

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff's complaint stated a cognizable claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act.
2. Whether the complaint was sufficiently clear and factually specific to satisfy the screening requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
3. Whether plaintiff should be granted leave to amend rather than have the action dismissed immediately.
4. Whether plaintiff qualified to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis was granted because his declaration showed that he could not afford to pay the entire filing fee.
2. The complaint failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted and was too difficult to follow to permit service on defendants.
3. Plaintiff was granted thirty days to file a first amended complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of Practice.
4. The complaint did not state a valid claim for relief under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Plaintiff's complaint is largely indecipherable." (at 3)

"Because of these defects, the court will not order the complaint to be served on defendants." (at 3)

"Your complaint will not be served because the facts alleged are not enough to state a claim." (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bobby Lee Collins, an incarcerated plaintiff proceeding without counsel, alleged that mental-health staff at Folsom State Prison and California State Prison, Sacramento violated the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Armstrong and Coleman settlements by failing to disclose diagnostic test results. The complaint included medical records from several prisons and medical facilities, but the court could not determine how those records related to the allegations or what relief plaintiff sought.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a prisoner civil-rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and moved to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted in forma pauperis status, screened the complaint, found that it failed to state a claim and was too unclear to serve, and granted plaintiff thirty days to file an amended complaint. The court warned that failure to amend would result in a recommendation of dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

DISPOSITION

CASES CITED

- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327 (1989)
- Jackson v. Arizona, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-557, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 93-94 (2007)
- Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974)
- Rizzo v. Goode, 423 U.S. 362, 370-71 (1976)
- Arnold v. International Business Machines Corp., 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981)
- Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978)
- Ivey v. Board of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967)
- Pennsylvania Department of Corrections v. Yeskey, 118 S. Ct. 1952, 1955 (1998)
- Armstrong v. Wilson, 124 F.3d 1019, 1023 (9th Cir. 1997)
- O'Guinn v. Lovelock Correctional Center, 502 F.3d 1056, 1060 (9th Cir. 2007)
- Thompson v. Davis, 295 F.3d 890, 895 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Payan v. Los Angeles Community College District, 11 F.4th 729, 738 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Duvall v. County of Kitsap, 260 F.3d 1124, 1138 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Simmons v. Navajo County, 609 F.3d 1011, 1022 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Bryant v. Madigan, 84 F.3d 246, 249 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104-05 (1976)
- Jett v. Penner, 439 F.3d 1091, 1096 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Hallett v. Morgan, 296 F.3d 732, 744 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1131-32 (9th Cir. 2000)
- McGuckin v. Smith, 974 F.2d 1050, 1059-60 (9th Cir. 1992)
- WMX Technologies, Inc. v. Miller, 104 F.3d 1133 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837, 839 (1994)
- Frost v. Agnos, 152 F.3d 1124, 1130 (9th Cir. 1998)