

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Abdul Rahim Sabir II v. San Francisco County Sheriff's Office

Sabir · No. 25-cv-06662-WHO (PR) · Decided January 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismissed Abdul Rahim Sabir II’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint against the San Francisco County Sheriff’s Office for failure to state a claim. The court granted leave to amend by March 2, 2026, denied the motion to proceed in forma pauperis as moot because the filing fee had been paid, and warned that failure to amend could result in dismissal for failure to prosecute.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	William H. Orrick
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	January 21, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-06662-WHO (PR)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court conducted preliminary screening of a pro se prisoner's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim, with leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must identify cognizable claims and dismiss claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a plausible claim for relief, and pro se pleadings are liberally construed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a plausible claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 when it identified only the San Francisco County Sheriff's Office and lacked the date, individual actors, and contextual facts surrounding the alleged strip search and filming.
2. Whether the complaint could proceed against supervisory defendants without allegations of their personal participation, direction, or knowledge of and failure to prevent the alleged constitutional violations.
3. Whether the complaint should be dismissed with leave to amend under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a claim because it did not provide sufficient factual information identifying the alleged perpetrators, the date and circumstances of the incident, or facts tying each defendant to the specific constitutional deprivation.
2. The complaint could not impose § 1983 liability on a supervisor based solely on a supervisory relationship; it needed facts showing that the supervisor participated in or directed the violation, or knew of the violation and failed to prevent it.
3. The complaint was dismissed with leave to file a first amended complaint by March 2, 2026.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Sabir must allege specific facts tying each specific person to the exact wrong.” (at 1)

“There is no respondeat superior liability under § 1983.” (at 4)

“Because an amended complaint completely replaces the previous complaints, plaintiff must include in his first amended complaint all the claims he wishes to present and all of the defendants he wishes to sue.” (at 4-5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that he was removed from a cell, placed in a safety cell, stripped nude in the presence of female nurses, deputies, and civilian personnel, filmed, and exploited without consent. He identified only the San Francisco County Sheriff's Office as a defendant and did not provide the date of the incident, the identities of the individuals involved, or the circumstances surrounding the transfer. The court found that these allegations did not provide sufficient facts tying any specific person to a constitutional violation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a § 1983 complaint alleging that unnamed personnel at the San Francisco Sheriff's Office stripped him nude in front of female staff and recorded the incident. The district court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, concluded that it lacked sufficient factual allegations and failed to identify defendants whose acts caused the alleged constitutional violation, and dismissed it with leave to file a first amended complaint by

March 2, 2026. The court also denied plaintiff's in forma pauperis motion as moot because he had paid the filing fee.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Department*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988)
- *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- *Clegg v. Cult Awareness Network*, 18 F.3d 752, 754-55 (9th Cir. 1994)
- *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988)
- *Leer v. Murphy*, 844 F.2d 628, 633 (9th Cir. 1988)
- *Johnson v. Duffy*, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978)
- *Keates v. Koile*, 883 F.3d 1228, 1241 (9th Cir. 2018)
- *Taylor v. List*, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989)
- *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1262 (9th Cir. 1992)