

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Dawson v. Napa County

No. 25-cv-01923-JSC (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2025) · No. 25-cv-01923-JSC · Decided August 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California denied Amanda Jeane Dawson's administrative motion to reopen or reset deadlines, toll deadlines, compel production of records, obtain a protective order, and enjoin alleged retaliation. The court held that Dawson was not prejudiced because she remained able to amend her complaint by August 29, 2025, and that discovery and related relief were procedurally improper at the pleadings stage. The court also explained that Dawson could not represent a related plaintiff and could not obtain an injunction affecting ongoing state child-custody proceedings through the administrative motion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacqueline Scott Corley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	August 1, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-01923-JSC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for administrative relief to reopen and reset missed deadlines, toll pending deadlines, compel production of records, obtain a protective order, enjoin alleged retaliation, and obtain related relief. The district court denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court evaluated the administrative motion under the applicable local rule and determined whether the requested extensions, tolling, discovery, protective order, and injunctive relief were procedurally proper and warranted.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Amanda Jeane Dawson v. Napa County, Napa County Child Welfare Services, Napa County Public Defender's Office, City of Napa

TOPICS

civil procedure

motions to dismiss

discovery dispute

injunctions

family law procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

family law

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Dawson was entitled to reopen and reset missed deadlines when she still had an existing deadline to amend her complaint and had not shown prejudice.
2. Whether the court should toll deadlines and permit discovery or compel production of records while the case remained at the pleadings stage after dismissal under Rule 12.
3. Whether Dawson could obtain a protective order concerning communications with Erik Milner when she was not a licensed attorney and could not represent him.
4. Whether the court could grant an injunction against alleged retaliation and ongoing child-custody or related state proceedings through an administrative motion.

HOLDINGS

1. The court denied Dawson's request to reopen and reset all missed deadlines because she had not been prejudiced and still had until August 29, 2025 to file an amended complaint.
2. Discovery and related record-production relief were procedurally improper at the pleadings stage because the court had dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim and no factual issues were presented by a Rule 12(b) motion.
3. The court denied the requested protective order because Dawson was not a licensed attorney and could not represent Milner in federal court.
4. The court denied Dawson's request to enjoin alleged retaliation and stated that it could not enjoin ongoing child-custody proceedings through the present administrative motion.
5. The court denied the administrative motion in its entirety and left August 29, 2025 as the deadline for Dawson to file an amended complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“discovery at the pleadings stage is only appropriate where factual issues are raised by a Rule 12(b) motion.”
(at 2)

“because the Court granted the defendants’ motion to dismiss Ms. Dawson’s complaint, the “doors of discovery” have not been unlocked.” (at 2)

“federal courts sitting in equity cannot, absent exceptional circumstances, enjoin pending state criminal proceedings.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Dawson sought relief based on alleged excusable neglect, medical disability, denial of access to records, and unconstitutional retaliation. She requested access to juvenile-dependency and criminal-court records, tolling of deadlines, a protective order concerning communications with Erik Milner, and an injunction against alleged retaliation by child-protective-services and law-enforcement personnel. The court noted that Dawson still had four weeks to amend her complaint after the prior dismissal order and that the complaint had been dismissed for failure to state a claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had previously granted defendants' motions to dismiss on July 25, 2025, while allowing Dawson until August 29, 2025, to amend her claims. Dawson then moved to reopen or extend deadlines and sought discovery, injunctive relief, and other administrative remedies. The court denied all requested relief and confirmed that August 29, 2025 remained the deadline for filing an amended complaint.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wagh v. Metris Direct, Inc., 363 F.3d 821, 829 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- ReadyLink Healthcare, Inc. v. State Comp. Ins. Fund, 754 F.3d 754, 758 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971)