

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Young v. County of Alameda

Young · No. 24-cv-03914-PCP · Decided July 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismissed the action without prejudice after Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint by the court-ordered deadline. The court stated that Plaintiff may move to reopen the action by filing an amended complaint and a motion to reopen.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	P. Casey Pitts
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	July 22, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-03914-PCP
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After dismissing the original complaint for failure to state a cognizable claim and granting partial leave to amend, the court dismissed the action without prejudice when the plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint by the deadline.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- [pleadings](#) [motion to amend](#) [civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

- [civil procedure](#) [civil rights](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice after the plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint despite being granted leave to amend and warned of the consequences.

HOLDINGS

- 1. A court may dismiss an action without prejudice when the plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint despite being given an opportunity to amend and warned of the consequences.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because Plaintiff failed to amend despite opportunity and a warning of the consequences, this action is DISMISSED without prejudice.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff's original complaint failed to state a cognizable claim for relief. The court granted partial leave to amend and set June 6, 2025, as the deadline for filing an amended complaint. The plaintiff did not amend despite being given an opportunity and warned of the consequences.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 28, 2025, the court dismissed the original complaint for failure to state a cognizable claim and granted partial leave to amend. The amended complaint was due June 6, 2025, but the plaintiff did not file one despite the opportunity and warning of the consequences. The court therefore dismissed the action without prejudice and stated that the plaintiff could move to reopen if he believed he could state a cognizable claim.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Harris v. Mangum, 863 F.3d 1133, 1141-42 (9th Cir. 2017)

OPINION

Young v. County of Alameda

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 WALTER LEE YOUNG, Case No. 24-cv-03914-PCP g Plaintiff, ORDER DISMISSING ACTION

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

9 v. 10 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al., 11 Defendants. L 13 On April 28, 2025, the Court dismissed the original complaint because it failed to state a 14 || cognizable claim for relief. Dkt. No. 16. The Court granted partial leave to amend. See id. The 3 15 amended complaint was due June 6, 2025, see id., but has not been filed, see generally, Dkt. a 16 Because Plaintiff failed to amend despite opportunity and a warning of the consequences, 17 || this action is DISMISSED

without prejudice. See *Harris v. Mangum*, 863 F.3d 1133, 1141-42 Z 18 || (9th Cir. 2017) (recognizing propriety of dismissing action where plaintiff failed to amend). 19 If Plaintiff believes he can state a cognizable claim, he may move to reopen this action. See 20 Fed. R. Civ. P. 59, 60. To do this, he must file an amended complaint in accordance with the 21 Court's previous order and a motion with the words MOTION TO REOPEN written on the first 22 || page. 23 24 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 || Dated: July 22, 2025 26 Ze 27 L Coy P. Casey Pitt 28 United States District Judge