

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Joseph Omar Sabir v. NaphCare Inc., Amanda Spayde, Michelle
Johnson, Spokane County, Sgt. Robert Brittos, Officer Thomas,
Officer Phillips, Officer Moser, Officer Rasmussen, Officer Howard,
and Officer Epley

No. 2:24-CV-00034-SAB (E.D. Wash. Mar. 3, 2026) · No. No. 2:24-CV-00034-SAB · Decided March 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington partially granted and partially denied defendants’ motion to dismiss Joseph Omar Sabir’s Third Amended Complaint. The court held that the claims against NaphCare, Inc. and Amanda Spayde were not time-barred and sufficiently pleaded, but claims against Michelle Johnson were time-barred because they did not relate back. The court dismissed the common-law negligence and gross-negligence claims against NaphCare and Spayde, while allowing the medical-negligence and § 1983 claims to proceed against the remaining defendants.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
DECIDED	March 3, 2026
DOCKET	No. 2:24-CV-00034-SAB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants NaphCare, Inc., Amanda Spayde, and Michelle Johnson moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss claims asserted in Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts factual allegations as true but does not accept conclusory allegations or a formulaic recitation of claim elements; the complaint must contain sufficient factual matter to state a claim and provide fair notice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Joseph Omar Sabir v. NaphCare Inc., Amanda Spayde, Michelle Johnson, Spokane County, Sgt. Robert Brittos, Officer Thomas,

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

statute of limitations

section 1983

medical malpractice

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

civil procedure

prisoner litigation

medical malpractice

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Sabir's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims were barred by the applicable statute of limitations.
2. Whether the Third Amended Complaint related back to the original complaint as to NaphCare and Amanda Spayde under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(c)(1).
3. Whether the claims against Michelle Johnson related back to the original complaint despite her addition after expiration of the limitations period.
4. Whether the Third Amended Complaint sufficiently pleaded Fourteenth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims under § 1983.
5. Whether Washington's medical-negligence statute provided the exclusive remedy for the alleged healthcare-related injuries and required dismissal of common-law negligence and gross-negligence claims.

HOLDINGS

1. Sabir's § 1983 claims were timely because the applicable three-year Washington limitations period was extended by 145 days of tolling for his pretrial detention, and the initial complaint was filed before the resulting June 29, 2024 deadline.
2. The Third Amended Complaint related back to the original complaint as to NaphCare and Amanda Spayde because the claims arose from the same conduct, the defendants had notice, and the pleadings' earlier references resulted from mistakes concerning identity.
3. The claims against Michelle Johnson were time barred because she was first named after expiration of the limitations period and there was no evidence that she should have known she would have been named but for a mistake concerning identity.
4. The Third Amended Complaint sufficiently stated § 1983 claims against the challenged defendants by alleging a timeline of medical requests, denials, and other actions relevant to deliberate indifference to serious medical needs.
5. Washington Revised Code § 7.70 provides the exclusive remedy for injuries arising in the healthcare context, so Sabir's common-law negligence and gross-negligence claims against NaphCare and Spayde were dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“An amended complaint relates back to the original complaint for the purposes of satisfying statutes of limitation when: (1) the basic claim arises out of the conduct set forth in the original pleading; (2) the party to be brought in received such notice that it will not be prejudiced in maintaining its defense; (3) that party knows or should have known that, but for a mistake concerning identity, the action would have been brought against it; and (4) the second and third requirements have been fulfilled within the prescribed limitations period.” (at 3)

“Plaintiff has alleged several facts to support a § 1983 claim, which requires him to show “acts or omissions sufficiently harmful to evidence deliberate indifference to serious medical needs.”” (at 6)

“However, as Wash. Rev. Code § 7.70 provides the exclusive remedy for injuries arising in the healthcare context, Plaintiff’s common law claims of negligence and gross negligence against NaphCare, Inc., Amanda Spayde, and Michelle Johnson are dismissed.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Sabir was detained at Spokane County Jail beginning January 24, 2021, and alleges that jail medical personnel failed to replace his Warfarin prescription or adequately investigate his medical history. He alleges that Nurses Amanda Spayde and Michelle Johnson ignored requests for blood thinners and failed to respond adequately to symptoms including breathing difficulty, chest pain, facial numbness, and vision loss. After he covered his cell window seeking medical attention and was forcibly removed from the cell, he was hospitalized and diagnosed with two acute frontal-lobe infarcts.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Sabir filed the action on February 2, 2024, initially asserting medical-malpractice claims against Spokane County and NaphCare staff. The court dismissed the initial complaint with leave to amend, and Sabir subsequently filed amended pleadings adding NaphCare, Amanda Spayde, and Michelle Johnson and asserting Fourteenth Amendment claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and medical-negligence claims. The court granted leave to file the Third Amended Complaint, which was filed on November 25, 2025. The court granted the motion to dismiss in part and denied it in part, dismissing Johnson as a defendant on limitations grounds and dismissing common-law negligence and gross-negligence claims against NaphCare and Spayde.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Schiavone v. Fortune, 477 U.S. 21, 29
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678
- Bell Atlantic v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555
- In re Gilead Sciences Securities Litigation, 536 F.3d 1049, 1054
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 106
- Jett v. Penner, 439 F.3d 1091, 1096

- Monell v. New York City Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 691
- Gordon v. County of Orange, 888 F.3d 1118, 1124-25
- Branom v. State, 94 Wash. App. 964, 969
- Bagley v. CMC Real Estate Corp., 923 F.2d 758, 760
- Lockett v. County of Los Angeles, 977 F.3d 737, 740

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-was/2026/joseph-omar-sabir-v-naphcare-inc-amanda-spayde-michelle-gpn5nt82>