

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Elayna J. Youchah
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	January 26, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01662-JAD-EJY
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court screened Plaintiff's Amended Complaint following an earlier screening order that granted leave to amend on four identified claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Screening of a prisoner civil-rights complaint for compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and whether it states a plausible claim for relief under <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> .
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive authority only.

TOPICS

- pleadings
- civil procedure
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Civil rights
- Prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Amended Complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)'s requirement of a short and plain statement of the claim.
2. Whether the Amended Complaint plausibly stated claims for relief by identifying the claims, responsible defendants, and supporting facts.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint whose factual elements are scattered throughout an unorganized narrative does not constitute a short and plain statement of the claim and may be dismissed for failure to comply with Rule 8(a). The Amended Complaint failed to meet that pleading standard.
2. Each claim must contain a short and plain statement of facts sufficient to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face; labels or conclusory assertions that unidentified defendants violated the Constitution are insufficient.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint having the factual elements of a cause of action scattered throughout an unorganized narrative is not a “short and plain statement of the claim,” and may be dismissed for failure to satisfy Rule 8(a).” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint after receiving leave to amend four identified claims in an earlier screening order. The court found that the Amended Complaint was rambling and incoherent, with factual elements of potential causes of action scattered throughout an unorganized narrative. The pleading did not clearly identify the causes of action, the defendants against whom each claim was brought, or facts showing how each defendant violated Plaintiff's rights.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

After screening the initial Complaint, the court granted Plaintiff leave to amend. The court then screened the Amended Complaint and dismissed it without prejudice for failure to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and failure to state a claim, granting one final opportunity to amend by filing a Second Amended Complaint.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Sparling v. Hoffman Construction Co., 864 F.2d 635, 640 (9th Cir. 1988)
- McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)

