

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF GUAM

Eddie Lawrence Quitugua v. Donna P. Quitugua, et al.

Quitugua · No. 1:25-cv-00036 · Decided December 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The District Court of Guam dismissed Eddie Lawrence Quitugua’s amended § 1983 civil rights complaint with prejudice. The court held that the claims were barred by the applicable two-year statute of limitations and declined to impose Rule 11 sanctions, while admonishing Plaintiff regarding alleged misquotations and an unverifiable case citation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Guam
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Frances M. Tydingco-Gatewood
JURISDICTION	District Court of Guam
DECIDED	December 3, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00036
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a pro se amended verified civil-rights complaint filed in forma pauperis under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the court must dismiss an in forma pauperis complaint that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court accepts material factual allegations as true and construes them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, while requiring sufficient factual matter to state a plausible claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- section 1983
- civil rights
- statute of limitations
- procedural due process
- equal protection

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- constitutional law
- civil procedure
- real estate
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's amended § 1983 claims were barred by the applicable two-year statute of limitations.
2. Whether Plaintiff's allegations supported equitable tolling until January 15, 2025, when an attorney allegedly confirmed the full extent of the fraud.
3. Whether further amendment would be futile.
4. Whether Plaintiff's alleged misquotations and citation of an apparently nonexistent case warranted Rule 11 sanctions.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's § 1983 claims were barred by the applicable two-year statute of limitations because he knew or had reason to know of the alleged injury and its cause no later than December 19, 2021, but did not file suit until September 17, 2025.
2. Plaintiff was not entitled to equitable tolling until January 15, 2025, because he knew of the alleged fraud and resulting injury no later than December 19, 2021.
3. The amended complaint was dismissed with prejudice because the limitations defect could not be cured by further amendment.
4. The court declined to impose Rule 11 sanctions at that time but admonished Plaintiff to ensure the accuracy of future pleadings and citations.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“the ‘cause of action accrues when the plaintiff knows or has reason to know of the injury that is the basis of the action and the cause of that injury.’” (Opinion at 8)

“Moreover, any further amendment to the Amended Complaint would be futile as nothing can change when Plaintiff learned of the fraud underlying his injury or when he filed this action in this court.” (Opinion at 10)

“The court further admonishes Plaintiff for his lack of compliance with Rule 11.” (Opinion at 12)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff lived at the disputed Guam property from 2010 until his eviction in December 2021. He alleged that family members and others created or used fraudulent deeds and title documents to establish ownership in Ryan C.P. Quitugua and to evict Plaintiff. Plaintiff alleged that he discovered an unaltered deed and the alleged notarization fraud on December 19, 2021, reported it to authorities shortly thereafter, and continued contacting authorities through 2024. He filed this federal action on September 17, 2025, asserting due-process, equal-protection, and civil-rights conspiracy claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an initial complaint alleging that Defendants conspired to deprive him of constitutional and civil rights through fraudulent property instruments and related proceedings. The court dismissed four claims without prejudice and dismissed two claims with prejudice, allowing amendment of the four surviving claims. Plaintiff

filed an amended complaint, and the court screened it under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), dismissed all claims with prejudice as barred by the statute of limitations, and admonished Plaintiff regarding Rule 11 without imposing sanctions.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126-27 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Nagrampa v. MailCoups, Inc., 469 F.3d 1257, 1264 n.2 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Barren v. Harrington, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Jones v. Williams, 297 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Hebbe v. Pliler, 627 F.3d 338, 342 n.7 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Jacobsen v. Filler, 790 F.2d 1362, 1364 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 54 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Bruns v. National Credit Union Administration, 122 F.3d 1251, 1257 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Flynt v. Shimazu, 940 F.3d 457, 461 (9th Cir. 2019)
- Nance v. Ward, 597 U.S. 159, 174 (2022)
- Ngiraingas v. Sanchez, 858 F.2d 1368, 1375 (9th Cir. 1988), aff'd on other grounds, 495 U.S. 182 (1990)
- Paeste v. Government of Guam, 798 F.3d 1228, 1237 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Taitano v. Calvo Finance Corp., 2008 Guam 12, ¶ 15 (Guam 2008)
- Gayle v. Hemlani, 2000 Guam 25, ¶ 24 (Guam 2000)
- Soto v. Sweetman, 882 F.3d 865, 871 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Wallace v. Kato, 549 U.S. 384, 388 (2007)
- Gregg v. Hawaii, Department of Public Safety, 870 F.3d 883, 887 (9th Cir. 2017)
- TwoRivers v. Lewis, 174 F.3d 987, 991 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Cervantes v. City of San Diego, 5 F.3d 1273, 1276 (9th Cir. 1993)
- Fink v. Gomez, 239 F.3d 989, 994 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Grant v. City of Long Beach, 96 F.4th 1255, 1256 (9th Cir. 2024)