

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Roger E. Clark v. Benjamin Denton Schnieder, et al.

Roger E. Clark v. Benjamin Denton Schnieder, et al. · No. 2:25-cv-2929-JDP (P) · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California screens a state prisoner’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint alleging Eighth Amendment violations arising from changes to cardiac treatment and alleged misdiagnosis. The court dismisses the complaint with leave to amend because it does not adequately identify each defendant’s responsibility or the physical injury resulting from allegedly denied cardiology appointments. The court grants the plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and allows thirty days to amend or voluntarily dismiss the action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-2929-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Initial screening of a state prisoner's pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, accepting the plausibility standard under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) and dismissing claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek relief from an immune defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court screening order
PARTIES	Roger E. Clark v. Benjamin Denton Schnieder, Tracy Patterson, Lori Green

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- pleadings
- civil procedure
- constitutional law

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

health law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a cognizable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 sufficient to proceed past mandatory prisoner screening.
2. Whether the complaint adequately identified what each defendant did, the legal theory and relief sought, and the physical injury allegedly caused by denied cardiology appointments.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a cognizable claim and was dismissed with leave to amend.
2. Plaintiff was granted leave to file an amended complaint addressing the identified deficiencies within thirty days.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint must contain a short and plain statement that plaintiff is entitled to relief, Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) (2), and provide “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face,” Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007).” (at 1)

“Complaints should be dismissed where “one cannot determine from the complaint who is being sued, for what relief, and on what theory.”” (at 1)

“Plaintiff’s complaint, ECF No. 1, is DISMISSED with leave to amend.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is a state prisoner who alleged that he suffers from chronic heart failure and uses a pacer. He claimed that defendants, healthcare providers at the California Medical Facility, violated his Eighth Amendment rights in 2024 by changing his cardiac treatment and misdiagnosing his cardiac condition. He also alleged that certain cardiology appointments were denied, but did not specify the physical injury caused by the missed appointments or the responsibility of each defendant.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil-rights complaint alleging that healthcare providers at the California Medical Facility violated his Eighth Amendment rights by changing his cardiac treatment and misdiagnosing his cardiac condition. The court screened the complaint, found that it did not adequately identify each defendant's responsibility or allege the physical injury resulting from missed cardiology appointments, dismissed the complaint with leave to amend, and granted plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009)
- Kobold v. Good Samaritan Reg'l Med. Ctr., 832 F.3d 1024, 1038 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Nagrampa v. MailCoups, Inc., 469 F.3d 1257, 1264 n.2 (9th Cir. 2006) (en banc)
- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972) (per curiam)
- Hayes v. Idaho Corr. Ctr., 849 F.3d 1204, 1208 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Bruns v. Nat'l Credit Union Admin., 122 F.3d 1251, 1257 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Ivey v. Bd. of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Lacey v. Maricopa Cnty., 693 F.3d 896, 907 n.1 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc)

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/roger-e-clark-v-benjamin-denton-schnieder-et-al-ht2nngeh>