

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Soraya Maria Rigor v. Sacramento Regional Transit, et al.

Rigor · No. 2:25-cv-00243-TLN-SCR · Decided June 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered pro se Plaintiff Soraya Maria Rigor to show cause why the action should not be dismissed. The court noted that Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint addressing defects identified in the prior screening order, including failure to state a claim, apparent untimeliness, and potential Heck v. Humphrey preclusion.

OPINION

(PS) Rigor v. Sacramento Regional Transit
PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 SORAYA MARIA RIGOR, No. 2:25-cv-00243-TLN-SCR
11 Plaintiff,

12 v. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

13 SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT,

et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 17 Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this action, which is referred to the undersigned pursuant 18 to Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On January 17, 2025, Plaintiff filed a 19 complaint and a motion to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). ECF Nos. 1 and 2. On May 16, 20 2025, this Court screened the complaint as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and found the 21 complaint was deficient in that it failed to state a claim and appeared to be time-barred and barred 22 by Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477, 483–87 (1994). The Court’s order provided Plaintiff 30 23 days to file an amended complaint that addresses the defects set forth in the screening order. ECF 24 No. 3 at 7. The order warned that failure to comply may result in a recommendation that the 25 action be dismissed. Id. More than 30 days have passed, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended 26 complaint. 27 /// 28] Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff shall show cause, in 2 | writing, within 14 days, why the failure to file an amended complaint should not result in a 3 || recommendation that this case be dismissed based on failure to state a claim. Plaintiff may 4 || respond by filing an amended complaint that complies with the Court’s prior order. If Plaintiff 5 || fails to respond, the court will

recommend dismissal of this case. See Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(b); Local 6 | Rule 110. 7 | SOORDERED.
8 | DATED: June 26, 2025 md 9
SEAN C. RIORDAN
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/soraya-maria-rigor-v-sacramento-regional-transit-et-al-hsandac0>