

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rosendo Gonzalez, Jr. v. Butte County, et al.

Case No. 2:25-cv-1491-TLN-JDP (PS) · No. 2:25-cv-1491-TLN-JDP (PS) · Decided October 14, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California recommends dismissing Rosendo Gonzalez, Jr.’s amended civil-rights complaint arising from his April 5, 2025 arrest. The court concludes that the allegations do not plausibly establish a false-arrest or other constitutional claim, that certain defendants are immune, and that amendment would be futile; it also denies as moot the motion for an extension of time.

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	October 14, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-1491-TLN-JDP (PS)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se plaintiff filed an amended complaint alleging federal constitutional claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and related state-law claims arising from his April 5, 2025 arrest. The magistrate judge screened the amended complaint and issued findings and recommendations recommending dismissal without leave to amend, while separately denying as moot a motion for an extension of time.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court screened the in forma pauperis complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), accepting well-pleaded allegations for purposes of determining whether they plausibly stated a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) and the Twombly/Iqbal standard. Pro se allegations were construed liberally, but the court could not supply essential elements not pleaded.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential; findings and recommendations subject to district-judge review

TOPICS

section 1983

civil procedure

police misconduct

constitutional law

pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

federal civil procedure

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint stated a plausible claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and related state law based on plaintiff's arrest and allegedly defective warrant.
2. Whether the claims against the state-court judges were barred by absolute judicial immunity.
3. Whether the allegation that the warrant lacked a wet-ink signature established that the warrant and arrest were invalid.
4. Whether plaintiff adequately pleaded the absence of probable cause necessary for a § 1983 false-arrest claim.
5. Whether plaintiff should be granted leave to amend again.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint failed to state a claim because its allegations were vague and conclusory and did not plausibly establish a constitutional violation or entitlement to relief.
2. The claims against Judges Leah Sears and Corie Caraway were barred by absolute judicial immunity because the alleged conduct consisted of judicial acts.
3. The alleged absence of a wet-ink signature did not render the warrant invalid.
4. Plaintiff failed to state a false-arrest claim because he did not plausibly allege that defendants lacked probable cause for his arrest.
5. Leave to amend should be denied because plaintiff had already amended and the deficiencies could not be cured by another amendment.

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,”” (at 2)

“It is well established that state judges are entitled to absolute immunity for their judicial acts.” (at 3)

“To state a false arrest claim, plaintiff must allege that he was arrested without probable cause.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that he was unlawfully seized and arrested on April 5, 2025, based on an allegedly invalid blood-draw or arrest warrant. He claimed the warrant lacked a judicial wet-ink signature and asserted violations of the First, Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, along with related state-law

claims. He named Butte County, the City of Chico, police and county officials, a hospital, prosecutors, and two state-court judges as defendants.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff previously filed a complaint and was given an opportunity to amend. He filed a first amended complaint, ECF No. 9, and moved for an extension of time, ECF No. 8. The magistrate judge concluded that the amended complaint failed to state a viable claim, denied the extension motion as moot, and recommended dismissal without leave to amend and closure of the action, subject to review by the assigned district judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

DISPOSITION

other

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), quoting Ivey v. Bd. of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- Swift v. California, 384 F.3d 1184, 1188 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Cleavinger v. Saxner, 474 U.S. 193, 199-200 (1985)
- Yousefian v. City of Glendale, 779 F.3d 1010, 1014 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Miller v. City of Scottsdale, 88 F.4th 800, 804 (9th Cir. 2023)
- Beier v. City of Lewiston, 354 F.3d 1058, 1064 (9th Cir. 2004), quoting Beck v. Ohio, 379 U.S. 89, 91 (1964)
- Sealey v. Branch Banking & Tr. Co., No. 2:17CV785-MHT-SMD, 2019 WL 1434065, at *2 (M.D. Ala. Feb. 21, 2019)
- United States v. Studley, 783 F.2d 934, 937 n.3 (9th Cir. 1986)
- United States v. Staten, No. 1:10-cr-179, 2012 WL 2389871, at *3 (M.D. Pa. June 25, 2012)
- Banks v. Florida, No. 19-756, 2019 WL 7546620, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 17, 2019)
- United States v. Wunder, No. 16-9452, 2019 WL 2928842, at *5 (D.N.J. July 8, 2019)
- Noll v. Carlson, 809 F.2d 1446, 1448 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Silva v. Di Vittorio, 658 F.3d 1090, 1105 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Martinez v. Yist, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)

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/rosendo-gonzalez-jr-v-butte-county-et-al-iosadk64>