

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Christopher Jacob Stevens v. Lincoln County, Nevada, et al.

Stevens · No. 2:25-cv-01662-JAD-EJY · Decided January 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada dismissed Plaintiff Christopher Jacob Stevens's Amended Complaint without prejudice for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and failure to state a claim. The court granted one final opportunity to amend and required any Second Amended Complaint to clarify the claims, defendants, supporting facts, and why the claims are not barred by Younger abstention.

OPINION

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 3 * * * 4 CHRISTOPHER JACOB STEVENS, Case No. 2:25-cv-01662-JAD-EJY 5 Plaintiff, ORDER 6 v. 7 LINCOLN COUNTY, NEVADA, et al., 8 Defendants. 9 10 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. ECF No. 6.

After screening 11 Plaintiff's initial Complaint, the Court granted leave to amend on four identified claims. ECF No. 3 12 at 10. Unfortunately, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint suffers from rambling incoherence that is, at 13 times, worse than the initial Complaint and, thus, does not meet the pleading standard required by 14 Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Plaintiff is given one final opportunity to amend. 15 A complaint having the factual elements of a cause of action scattered throughout an 16 unorganized narrative is not a "short and plain statement of the claim," and may be dismissed for 17 failure to satisfy Rule 8(a). See Sparling v. Hoffman Constr. Co., 864 F.2d 635, 640 (9th Cir. 1988); 18 see also McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir.

1996). At best, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint 19 suffers from this failure. Plaintiff is advised that if he chooses to file a Second Amended Complaint 20 it must clearly identify the causes of action—the claims he seeks to assert—the defendants against 21 whom each claim is brought, and the facts that demonstrate the defendant violated Plaintiff's rights. 22 Each claim must include a short and plain statement of facts sufficient to state a claim for relief that 23 is plausible on its face.

Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). While this standard does not 24 require detailed allegations, Plaintiff must provide more than just labels stating unidentified 25 defendants violated the Constitution. See Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). 26 Plaintiff should consult the Court's prior screening Order (ECF No. 3) outlining which claims the 27 Court

construed Plaintiff to be stating and providing guidance on what he must demonstrate to state 1
Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (ECF No. 6) 2 is
DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, with
3 one final leave to amend.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff chooses to file an amended complaint he must 5 do
so no later than February 26, 2026. The amended complaint must be titled "SECOND 6
AMENDED COMPLAINT" and must be complete—meaning all facts and all claims Plaintiff 7
wishes to assert must be stated in the amended complaint. Plaintiff must identify the individual or
8 entity involved in the wrongdoing, and allege facts that show that individual or entity engaged in
9 conduct that supports the claim Plaintiff asserts.

Plaintiff must also make clear to the Court why his 10 claims are not barred by Younger
abstention. Plaintiff should not state claims that have been 11 dismissed with prejudice. 12
DATED this 26th day of January, 2026. 13 14 ELAYNA J. YOUCHAH 15 UNITED STATES
MAGISTRATE JUDGE 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27