

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Curtis Lee Henderson, Sr. v. Fresno County Jail, et al.

Henderson · No. 1:24-cv-001569-JLT-SKO · Decided December 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The court recommends allowing Curtis Lee Henderson, Sr.’s specified First and Eighth Amendment claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to proceed against certain defendants in their individual capacities. It further recommends dismissing Fresno County Jail and several named defendants, as well as any remaining claims, subject to a 14-day objection period.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sheila K. Oberto
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 5, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-001569-JLT-SKO
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Findings and recommendations issued after screening a pro se prisoner's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. The magistrate judge recommended that the action proceed only on specified cognizable claims, that certain defendants be dismissed, and that all remaining claims be dismissed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The findings and recommendations were subject to review by the assigned district judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- civil rights
- section 1983
- pleadings
- civil procedure
- first amendment

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- constitutional law
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should proceed only on the First Amendment retaliation and Eighth Amendment claims identified as cognizable in the prior screening order.
2. Whether Fresno County Jail and the specified defendants should be dismissed from the action.
3. Whether the remaining claims in the complaint should be dismissed.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Curtis Lee Henderson, Sr. brought a pro se civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 while proceeding in forma pauperis. The court's prior screening order found plausible claims for First Amendment retaliation and several Eighth Amendment violations against specified defendants in their individual capacities, but identified other claims and defendants as subject to dismissal. Henderson elected to proceed only on the claims identified as cognizable.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously screened Plaintiff's complaint and identified cognizable First and Eighth Amendment claims while directing Plaintiff to elect whether to proceed on those claims, amend, or voluntarily dismiss the action. After the screening order was re-served following an address issue, Plaintiff filed a notice electing to proceed on the cognizable claims. The magistrate judge then issued findings and recommendations under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), subject to objections and review by the assigned district judge.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)