

**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

OPINION

1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7
AMANDA JEANE DAWSON, Case No. 25-cv-01923-JSC 8 Plaintiff, ORDER RE:
ADMINISTRATIVE 9 v. MOTION TO RESET DEADLINES AND REQUEST FOR
EQUITABLE 10 NAPA COUNTY, et al., TOLLING 11 Defendants. Re: Dkt. No. 46 12 13
Pending before the Court is a motion for administrative relief.

On July 26, 2025, “[p]ro se 14 Plaintiffs AMANDA JEANE DAWSON and ERIK RANDALL
MILNER respectfully move[d] 15 this Court to reopen and reset all missed deadlines and toll all
pending ones... on the grounds of 16 excusable neglect, medical disability, denial of access to
records, and unconstitutional retaliation 17 that obstructs participation in judicial proceedings.”
(Dkt.

No. 46 at 1.) Napa County, Napa 18 County Child Welfare Services, and Napa County Public
Defender’s Office (“County 19 Defendants”) oppose the motion. (Dkt. No. 47.) City of Napa also
opposes the motion, although 20 its opposition was not timely filed. (Dkt. No. 48); Civ. L. R. 7-
11(b) (stating opposition “must be 21 filed no later than 4 days after the [administrative] motion
has been filed).

22 The Court begins with the requests as to Mr. Milner’s cases, 25-cv-3350 and 25-cv-3428. 23
Those two cases were related to this action pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12, which permits the
24 relation of cases when “[t]he actions concern substantially the same parties, property,
transaction, 25 or event” and “[i]t appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome
duplication of labor and 26 expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before
different Judges.” Although 27 related, the cases remain separate actions.

And it remains true that Ms. Dawson cannot act as Mr. 1 right to represent [Mr. Milner] in this
Court. Only licensed attorneys may represent others in this 2 Court.” (Case No. 25-cv-3428, Dkt.
No. 9.) So, the Court disregards any requests in the present 3 motion to reopen, toll, or extend
deadlines in Mr. Milner’s case. Mr. Milner—or a licensed 4 attorney representing Mr. Milner—
must request such relief in Case Nos. 25-cv-3350 and/or 25-cv- 5 3428.

6 The Court turns to Ms. Dawson’s request as it relates to this case, 25-cv-01923. Ms. 7 Dawson
requests the following relief: 8 1. Reset and reopen all missed deadlines...; 2. Toll all active

deadlines until: 9 -Juvenile dependency records... are produced; -All criminal court records from august 31, 2023, to 10 present are disclosed...; 3. Issue an Order to Show Cause to compel Napa County and 11 the Superior Court to explain the delay in producing records; 12 4.

Grant a protective order allowing confidential legal communication between Amanda Dawson and Erik 13 Milner; 5. Set a joint case management hearing to establish equitable 14 deadlines; 6. Enjoin further retaliation by CPS and law enforcement 15 pending resolution of these civil rights claims; 7. Allow leave to amend any complaints or motions once 16 withheld evidence is provided.

17 (Dkt. No. 46 at 6.) 18 The Court DENIES Ms. Dawson's request to "[r]eset and reopen all missed deadlines." 19 Although Ms. Dawson missed the original deadline to oppose the motions to dismiss and the 20 extended deadline the Court subsequently provided, (Dkt. No. 37), Ms. Dawson has not been 21 prejudiced.

In its July 25, 2025 order granting the motions to dismiss, the Court granted Ms. 22 Dawson until August 29, 2025 to amend her claims against County Defendants and City of Napa. 23 (Dkt. No. 45 at 13.) As of the date of this order, Ms. Dawson still has four weeks to file an 24 amended complaint, so further extending this deadline is unnecessary. If Ms. Dawson files an 25 amended complaint and County Defendants and/or City of Napa move to dismiss, Ms. Dawson 26 may meet and confer with those defendants about an extended briefing schedule on such motions.

27 The Court thus DENIES Ms. Dawson's request for "a case management hearing to establish 1 into account Ms. Dawson's circumstances. 2 The Court also DENIES Ms. Dawson's request to toll deadlines until certain transcripts 3 and other records are produced. Ms. Dawson essentially seeks discovery.

However, "discovery at 4 the pleadings stage is only appropriate where factual issues are raised by a Rule 12(b) motion." 5 *Wagh v. Metris Direct, Inc.*, 363 F.3d 821, 829 (9th Cir. 2003). At this point, there are no factual 6 issues: the Court accepted as true the allegations in Ms. Dawson's complaint and determined those 7 allegations failed to state a claim.

Put another way, because the Court granted the defendants' 8 motion to dismiss Ms. Dawson's complaint, the "doors of discovery" have not been unlocked. See 9 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (cleaned up). So, it would be procedurally improper 10 to order discovery at this time.

Accordingly, the Court DENIES Ms. Dawson's corresponding 11 requests to "[i]ssue an Order to Show Cause to compel Napa County and the Superior Court to 12 explain the delay in producing records" and to "[a]llow leave to amend any complaints or motions 13 once withheld evidence is provided." Although, as discussed above, Ms. Dawson has until August 14 29, 2025 to amend her complaint.

15 The Court DENIES Ms. Dawson's request to "[g]rant a protective order allowing 16
confidential legal communication between Amanda Dawson and Erik Milner" because, as 17
discussed above, Ms. Dawson is not a licensed attorney and therefore cannot represent Mr. Milner.
18 Finally, the Court DENIES Ms. Dawson's request to "[e]njoin further retaliation by CPS 19
and law enforcement pending resolution of these civil rights claims." The Court understands this
20 request as related to Ms. Dawson's assertion that "[g]overnment actors have delayed,
obstructed, 21 and reversed reunification without legal authority." (Dkt.

No. 46 at 5.) Ms. Dawson may attempt 22 to allege as much in her amended complaint, but the
Court cannot grant the requested relief 23 through the present administrative motion. Moreover, as
the Court explained in a prior order: 24 "[F]ederal courts sitting in equity cannot, absent
exceptional circumstances, enjoin pending state criminal proceedings." 25 ReadyLink Healthcare,
Inc. v. State Comp.

Ins. Fund, 754 F.3d 754, 758 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 26
(1971)). This principle has been extended "to civil enforcement actions akin to criminal
proceedings, and to suits challenging the core 27 of the administration of a State's judicial
system." *Id.* (cleaned up); allegedly abused by their parents). 2 (Dkt. No. 18.)

To the extent Ms. Dawson asks the Court to enjoin ongoing child custody 3 proceedings, the Court
cannot do so. 4 In sum, Ms. Dawson's administrative motion is DENIED. August 29, 2025
remains the 5 deadline for Ms. Dawson to file an amended complaint in this action. If she files an
amended 6 || complaint, Ms. Dawson may meet and confer with County Defendants and City of
Napa about 7 || extending the briefing schedule if the defendants move to dismiss the amended
complaint.

As 8 || noted in the Court's prior order, "[i]f Plaintiff does not file an amended complaint by
[August 29, 9 || 2025], judgment will be entered in Defendants' favor." (Dkt. No. 45 at 13.) 10
This Order disposes of Docket No. 46. 11 IT IS SO ORDERED. e 12 Dated: August 1, 2025 ne 4
'A CWELINE SCOTT CORLE IS United States District Judge 16 = 17 Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
26 27 28