

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Jerimie Lunsford v. State of Oregon; Benjamin Smith; Warren Roberts; Karen Harris; Aimee Hughes

Lunsford v. State of Oregon, Civ. No. 6:25-cv-02284-AA (D. Or. Apr. 30, 2026) · No. Civ. No. 6:25-cv-02284-AA · Decided April 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon granted Defendant Warren Roberts’s motion to dismiss claims alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs under the Eighth Amendment. The court held that the complaint did not sufficiently allege Roberts’s direct involvement or a specific policy or supervisory conduct causing the alleged constitutional injury. Dismissal was without prejudice and with leave to amend within 30 days; the court did not reach qualified immunity.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Ann Aiken
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	April 30, 2026
DOCKET	Civ. No. 6:25-cv-02284-AA
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant Warren Roberts moved to dismiss the claims against him for failure to state a claim and on qualified-immunity grounds. The court granted the motion and dismissed the claims against Roberts with leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6)-type motion to dismiss, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true and asks whether the complaint contains sufficient factual matter to state a claim that is plausible on its face. Legal conclusions and wholly conclusory allegations need not be accepted as true.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Jerimie Lunsford v. Warren Roberts

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

cruel and unusual punishment

motions to dismiss

qualified immunity

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

constitutional law

prisoner medical care

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged that Warren Roberts personally participated in or was directly involved in an unconstitutional denial or delay of medical care.
2. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged supervisory liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 based on Roberts's policies, supervision, or alleged role in the Therapeutic Level of Care Committee.
3. Whether the claims against Roberts should be dismissed with leave to amend.
4. Whether the court needed to reach Roberts's qualified-immunity defense after determining that the complaint failed to state a claim.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to plausibly allege that Roberts personally participated in, knew of, or made a decision concerning Lunsford's alleged denial or delay of medical care.
2. The complaint failed to state a supervisory-liability claim against Roberts because its allegations concerning Roberts's policies, supervision, and role in the Therapeutic Level of Care Committee were conclusory and did not identify a specific policy or event by Roberts that caused Lunsford's injury.
3. Dismissal of the claims against Roberts was warranted, but the dismissal was entered with leave to amend because the pleading defects might be remedied by alleging additional facts.
4. The court did not reach the qualified-immunity argument because the claims were subject to dismissal for failure to state a claim on other grounds.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To survive a motion to dismiss under the federal pleading standards, a pleading must contain a short and plain statement of the claim and allege ‘sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’”

“Prison officials and physicians violate the Eighth Amendment’s proscription against cruel and unusual punishment when they act with deliberate indifference to an inmate’s serious medical needs.”

“The Court concludes that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim for violation of his Eighth Amendment rights against Dr. Roberts and so the motion to dismiss will be granted.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Lunsford was in the custody of the Oregon Department of Corrections and received medical care at the Oregon State Penitentiary. After reporting blood in his stool and experiencing prolonged diarrhea and abdominal pain, he alleged that recommended endoscopic testing was not performed and that his condition worsened before he was

diagnosed with metastatic colon cancer. He sued several prison medical officials, including Warren Roberts, the former ODOC Chief of Medicine, alleging that Roberts was involved in the Therapeutic Level of Care Committee and in ODOC policies that caused denial or delay of medically necessary treatment. The complaint did not clearly allege that Lunsford's condition or proposed treatment was referred to the committee, that Roberts made a decision concerning Lunsford's care, or that a Roberts policy caused the alleged injury.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Lunsford filed claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for alleged Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference to serious medical needs against individual defendants and a negligence claim against the State of Oregon. Roberts removed the action from Marion County Circuit Court to the federal district court on December 8, 2025, and then moved to dismiss. The court granted dismissal with leave to amend and allowed Lunsford thirty days to file an amended complaint.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was ordered. Lunsford was granted thirty days from April 30, 2026, to submit an amended complaint.

CASES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 667, 676-78 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Conn v. Gabbert, 526 U.S. 286, 290 (1999)
- Anderson v. Warner, 451 F.3d 1063, 1067 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976)
- Jett v. Penner, 439 F.3d 1091, 1096 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Toguchi v. Chung, 391 F.3d 1051, 1057 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Colwell v. Bannister, 763 F.3d 1060, 1066 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Hallett v. Morgan, 296 F.3d 732, 746 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Starr v. Baca, 652 F.3d 1202, 1207-08 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Hansen v. Black, 885 F.2d 642, 646 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Chavez v. United States, 683 F.3d 1102, 1110 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Munoz v. Oregon, Case No. 6:22-cv-1348-SI, 2025 WL 3187572, at *6 (D. Or. Nov. 14, 2025)
- Hydrick v. Hunter, 669 F.3d 937, 942 (9th Cir. 2012)