

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Flores v. Boudreaux

No. 1:24-cv-00888-BAM (PC) (E.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2025) · No. 1:24-cv-00888-BAM (PC) · Decided March 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California screened a pro se prisoner civil-rights complaint alleging inadequate medical care, excessive force, retaliation, and disability-related violations. The court found that the complaint failed to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8, 18, and 20 and failed to state cognizable claims, and recommended dismissal based on failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order, and failure to state a claim.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Barbara A. McAuliffe
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	March 10, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00888-BAM (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se former county jail inmate proceeding in forma pauperis brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging retaliation, excessive force, inadequate medical care, Americans with Disabilities Act violations, and related constitutional violations. After screening the complaint, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal with prejudice for failure to obey a court order, failure to prosecute, and failure to state a claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	At screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, disregards legal conclusions and unwarranted inferences, and determines whether the complaint states a facially plausible claim. For dismissal based on failure to prosecute or obey a court order, the court applies the Ninth Circuit's five-factor test concerning expeditious resolution, docket management, prejudice, disposition on the merits, and availability of less drastic sanctions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished_nonprecedential

PARTIES

Juan Fidencio Flores v. Mike Boudreaux and other defendants

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

civil procedure

pleadings

ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

civil procedure

constitutional law

disability discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a cognizable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and complied with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8, 18, and 20.
2. Whether the complaint adequately alleged personal participation or a causal link between each defendant and the alleged constitutional violations.
3. Whether the complaint adequately alleged claims for inadequate medical care, excessive force, retaliation, and ADA violations.
4. Whether the action should be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order, and failure to state a claim.
5. Whether the requested injunctive relief complied with the Prison Litigation Reform Act's narrow-tailoring and least-intrusive-means requirements.

HOLDINGS

1. A Section 1983 complaint must provide sufficient factual matter to state a facially plausible claim and must link each defendant's own actions or omissions to the alleged constitutional deprivation; conclusory allegations that a group of defendants was responsible are insufficient.
2. A prisoner may not bring unrelated claims against unrelated defendants in a single action; claims against multiple defendants may be joined only when they arise from the same transaction or occurrence and share common questions of law or fact.
3. Supervisory personnel are not liable under Section 1983 solely based on respondeat superior; liability requires personal participation, direction, knowledge coupled with failure to act, or implementation of a constitutionally deficient policy that was the moving force behind the violation.
4. A pretrial detainee alleging inadequate medical care under the Fourteenth Amendment must plead facts supporting an objective deliberate-indifference claim, including an intentional decision, a substantial risk of serious harm, objectively unreasonable conduct, and causation of injury.
5. A district court may dismiss an action, including with prejudice, when a plaintiff fails to prosecute or obey a court order, after considering the Ninth Circuit's five dismissal factors and the availability of less drastic sanctions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Plaintiff may not bring unrelated claims against unrelated parties in a single action.” (at 23)

“Liability may not be imposed on supervisory personnel for the actions or omissions of their subordinates under the theory of respondeat superior.” (at 30)

“The Court’s January 13, 2025 order expressly warned Plaintiff that his failure to comply with the Court’s order would result in dismissal of this action, with prejudice.” (at 63)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a former county jail inmate proceeding pro se, alleged that he was paralyzed, suffered pressure ulcers and other medical problems, and was subjected to inadequate transportation, medical treatment, housing accommodations, and retaliation after filing grievances. The court previously ordered him to amend his complaint or voluntarily dismiss the action and expressly warned that failure to comply could result in dismissal with prejudice. The order was returned as undeliverable, Plaintiff did not provide a new address or otherwise communicate with the court, and the response deadline expired.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court screened Plaintiff’s complaint on January 13, 2025, granted leave to file a first amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal within thirty days, and warned that noncompliance could result in dismissal with prejudice. The screening order was returned as undeliverable because Plaintiff was no longer in custody, and Plaintiff did not file a change of address or respond. The magistrate judge ordered random assignment of a district judge and issued findings and recommendations that the action be dismissed with prejudice, subject to fourteen days for objections.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)
- Doe I v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 572 F.3d 677, 681 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Moss v. U.S. Secret Service, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)
- Rizzo v. Goode, 423 U.S. 362 (1976)
- Owens v. Hinsley, 635 F.3d 950, 952 (7th Cir. 2011)
- George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Mackey v. Price, 2020 WL 7319420, at *3-4 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2020)
- Coughlin v. Rogers, 130 F.3d 1348, 1349, 1351 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Simmons v. Navajo County, Arizona, 609 F.3d 1011, 1020-21 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Ewing v. City of Stockton, 588 F.3d 1218, 1235 (9th Cir. 2009)

- Jones v. Williams, 297 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Taylor v. List, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Starr v. Baca, 652 F.3d 1202, 1205-06 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Corales v. Bennett, 567 F.3d 554, 570 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Redman v. County of San Diego, 942 F.2d 1435, 1446 (9th Cir. 1991)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825 (1970)
- Fayle v. Stapley, 607 F.2d 858, 862 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Mosher v. Saalfeld, 589 F.2d 438, 441 (9th Cir. 1978)
- Ivey v. Board of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- Gordon v. County of Orange, 888 F.3d 1118, 1124-25 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Castro v. County of Los Angeles, 833 F.3d 1060, 1071 (9th Cir. 2016) (en banc)
- City of Revere v. Massachusetts General Hospital, 463 U.S. 239, 244 (1983)
- Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520, 535 (1979)
- Oregon Advocacy Center v. Mink, 322 F.3d 1101, 1120 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Gibson v. County of Washoe, 290 F.3d 1175, 1197 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Tatum v. City and County of San Francisco, 441 F.3d 1090, 1095 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386, 396-97 (1989)
- Lolli v. County of Orange, 351 F.3d 410, 415 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Kingsley v. Hendrickson, 576 U.S. 389, 396-97 (2015)
- Vinson v. Thomas, 288 F.3d 1145, 1156 (9th Cir. 2002)
- United States v. Georgia, 546 U.S. 151, 153 (2006)
- Pennsylvania Department of Corrections v. Yeskey, 524 U.S. 206, 210 (1998)
- Armstrong v. Wilson, 124 F.3d 1019, 1023, 1025 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Hernandez v. Johnston, 833 F.2d 1316, 1319 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Rizzo v. Dawson, 778 F.2d 527, 532 (9th Cir. 1985)
- Valandingham v. Bojorquez, 866 F.2d 1135 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Pratt v. Rowland, 65 F.3d 802, 807 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Rhodes v. Robinson, 408 F.3d 559, 567-68 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Watison v. Carter, 668 F.3d 1108, 1114-15 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Brodheim v. Cry, 584 F.3d 1262, 1269 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Ramirez v. Galaza, 334 F.3d 850, 860 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Shallowhorn v. Molina, 572 F. App'x 545, 547 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Gomez v. Whitney, 757 F.2d 1005, 1006 (9th Cir. 1985) (per curiam)
- Schucker v. Rockwood, 846 F.2d 1202, 1204 (9th Cir. 1988) (per curiam)
- Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991) (per curiam)
- Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 356-57 (1978)
- Meek v. County of Riverside, 183 F.3d 962, 965 (9th Cir. 1999)

- *Committee of Central American Refugees v. I.N.S.*, 795 F.2d 1434, 1441 (9th Cir. 1986)
- *Martin v. International Olympic Committee*, 740 F.2d 670, 675 (9th Cir. 1984)
- *Hells Canyon Preservation Council v. U.S. Forest Service*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005)
- *Thompson v. Housing Authority*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986)
- *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995)
- *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-62 (9th Cir. 1992)
- *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130-33 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976)
- *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 (9th Cir. 2002)
- *In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1228-29 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)
- *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/flores-v-boudreaux-npef2csg>