

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Torres v. St. Andre, et al.

Torres · No. 2:24-cv-2447-JDP (P) · Decided August 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California dismisses plaintiff Abraham L. Torres’s prisoner civil-rights complaint with leave to amend. The court finds that the complaint is difficult to understand, fails to provide each of eighteen defendants fair notice of the claims, and includes retaliation claims that do not appear sufficiently related to the medical-care claims. Plaintiff is given thirty days to file an amended complaint or voluntarily dismiss the action.

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	August 4, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-2447-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights action screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; the court dismissed the complaint with leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Statutory screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; failure-to-state-a-claim and pleading sufficiency standards under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) and 12(b)(6)-type plausibility principles.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Abraham L. Torres v. St. Andre, et al.

TOPICS

- pleadings
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- pleading sufficiency
- federal court screening

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint satisfied the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by providing each defendant fair notice of the claims and the grounds on which relief was sought.
2. Whether the complaint stated claims sufficiently related to one another to proceed in the same action.
3. Whether the complaint should be dismissed under the prisoner-screening requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and whether leave to amend should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 because its disorganized, repetitive, and unclear allegations did not give each defendant fair notice of the claims asserted against that defendant.
2. The retaliation claims arising from alleged December 2024 conduct did not appear sufficiently related to the claims concerning inadequate medical care to proceed in the same action.
3. The complaint was dismissed with leave to amend, and plaintiff was given a final opportunity to file an intelligible complaint complying with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, I will dismiss the complaint with leave to amend, so that plaintiff may file an intelligible complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.” (at 1)

“Based on these deficiencies, the pleading fails to give each defendant fair notice of the claims against him or her, as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require.” (at 2)

“These claims do not appear sufficiently related to his other claims for inadequate medical care to proceed in the same suit.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that he contracted COVID-19 in August 2024 after being forced to share a cell with an infected inmate. He asserted claims against eighteen defendants, but the complaint lacked coherent paragraphing and claim organization, repeated allegations, and did not clearly identify how each defendant was involved. Plaintiff also alleged that defendants retaliated against him in December 2024 by destroying his property, placing him in a holding cage for an extended period, and imposing other adverse consequences.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint against eighteen defendants alleging violations of his rights, including claims arising from contracting COVID-19 after being housed with an infected inmate and later retaliation claims. On screening, the district court found the pleading unintelligible, insufficiently organized to provide fair notice, and apparently joined claims that were not sufficiently related. The court dismissed the complaint with leave to amend and permitted plaintiff either to file an amended complaint or voluntarily dismiss the action without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-679 (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)
- Ivey v. Bd. of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- Lacey v. Maricopa County, 693 F.3d 896, 907 n.1 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc)