

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

Anthony Trevon Kornegay v. Stg. Sgt. Christopher Gilbert, et al.

Civil No. 26-00058 DKW-RT (D. Haw. June 26, 2026) · No. Civil No. 26-00058 DKW-RT · Decided June 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Hawaii dismissed Anthony Trevon Kornegay’s second amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint against three correctional officials. The court held that the claims were improperly joined and that the allegations failed to state plausible Fourteenth Amendment claims concerning safety, excessive force, and medical care. The dismissal was with prejudice, without leave to amend, and counted as a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Hawaii
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Derrick K. Watson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Hawaii
DECIDED	June 26, 2026
DOCKET	Civil No. 26-00058 DKW-RT
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a pro se pretrial detainee's second amended prisoner civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(a).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) plausibility standard during screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(a), accepting adequately pleaded factual allegations as true and liberally construing the pro se complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Anthony Trevon Kornegay v. Stg. Sgt. Christopher Gilbert, Sgt. J. Dardeen, Registered Nurse Matthew Hubbard

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- joinder
- motions to dismiss
- due process

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Kornegay improperly joined claims arising from separate events and involving different defendants in one action.
2. Whether the allegations plausibly stated a Fourteenth Amendment threat-to-safety claim against Sergeant Gilbert.
3. Whether the allegations plausibly stated a Fourteenth Amendment excessive-force claim against Sergeant Dardeen.
4. Whether the allegations plausibly stated a Fourteenth Amendment inadequate-medical-care claim against Nurse Hubbard.
5. Whether further leave to amend should be denied as futile after two prior opportunities to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. Claims involving different defendants may be joined in one action only when the claims arise from the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences and present a common question of law or fact. Kornegay's housing, excessive-force, and medical-care claims arose from distinct events and were improperly joined.
2. A pretrial detainee must plausibly allege that the defendant intentionally made a confinement decision, the resulting conditions placed the detainee at substantial risk of serious harm, the defendant failed to take reasonable available measures despite an objectively high risk, and that failure caused injury. Kornegay failed to plead sufficient facts showing substantial risk or objective unreasonableness.
3. A pretrial detainee must show that force purposely or knowingly used against him was objectively unreasonable. Kornegay failed to state a claim because he did not adequately describe what Sergeant Dardeen did, establish that Dardeen caused the injuries, or explain whether he resisted or complied with instructions.
4. A pretrial detainee asserting inadequate medical care must plausibly allege an intentional decision, a substantial risk of serious harm, failure to take reasonable available measures despite an objectively apparent risk, and causation. Mere negligence or disagreement with treatment is insufficient. Kornegay failed to state a claim against Nurse Hubbard.
5. Further leave to amend may be denied when amendment would be futile, including after repeated failure to cure identified pleading deficiencies. Because Kornegay had two prior opportunities and repeated guidance but alleged the same defects, the court denied further leave to amend.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Unrelated claims involving different defendants belong in different suits.” (Section III.B)

“A pretrial detainee who asserts a threat-to-safety claim must “prove more than negligence but less than subjective intent—something akin to reckless disregard.”” (Section III.C)

“the appropriate standard for a pretrial detainee’s excessive force claim is solely an objective one.” (Section III.D)

“The “mere lack of due care by a state official does not deprive an individual of life, liberty, or property under the Fourteenth Amendment”; the plaintiff must “prove more than negligence but less than subjective intent—something akin to reckless disregard.”” (Section III.E)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Kornegay was a pretrial detainee at Oahu Community Correctional Center. He alleged that Sergeant Gilbert housed him in a module where he had previously been attacked, that Sergeant Dardeen injured his hand, foot, knee, and back during an attack, and that Nurse Hubbard denied him adequate medical care despite apparent injuries. Kornegay sought \$9 million in damages from the three defendants in their individual capacities.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Kornegay filed the original § 1983 complaint on January 13, 2026. The court dismissed the original complaint on March 10, 2026, and dismissed the first amended complaint on June 2, 2026, while granting opportunities to cure pleading defects. After receiving the second amended complaint on June 24, 2026, the court dismissed it under the statutory screening provisions because the claims were improperly joined and none stated a plausible claim for relief. The court denied further leave to amend, dismissed the action with prejudice and without leave to amend, directed entry of judgment, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Nordstrom v. Ryan, 762 F.3d 903, 906 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Byrd v. Phoenix Police Department, 885 F.3d 639, 641 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126-27, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)
- Rhodes v. Robinson, 621 F.3d 1002, 1004 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Rosati v. Igbino, 791 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2015) (per curiam)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Hebbe v. Pliler, 627 F.3d 338, 342 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Sylvia Landfield Trust v. City of Los Angeles, 729 F.3d 1189, 1196 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Cornel v. Hawaii, 37 F.4th 527, 531 (9th Cir. 2022)
- West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988)
- Park v. City & County of Honolulu, 952 F.3d 1136, 1140 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Weeks v. Espinda, 2010 WL 2218631, at *3 (D. Haw. June 2, 2010)

- What v. Honolulu Police Department, 2014 WL 176610, at *4 (D. Haw. Jan. 13, 2014)
- Woolen v. Ramos, 2024 WL 3361116, at *4 (D. Haw. July 10, 2024)
- Char v. Kaiser Hospital, 2019 WL 80890, at *3 (D. Haw. Jan. 2, 2019)
- Castro v. County of Los Angeles, 833 F.3d 1060, 1071 (9th Cir. 2016) (en banc)
- Kingsley v. Hendrickson, 576 U.S. 389, 396-97 (2015)
- Gordon v. County of Orange, 888 F.3d 1118, 1124-25 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Penque v. Department of Public Safety, No. CV 20-00338 DKW-WRP, 2020 WL 7322721, at *6 (D. Haw. Dec. 11, 2020)
- Zucco Partners, LLC v. Digimarc Corp., 552 F.3d 981, 1007 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962)
- Gardner v. Pogue, 558 F.2d 548, 550 (9th Cir. 1977)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-hawaii-united-states-district-court-for-the-district/2026/anthony-trevon-kornegay-v-stg-srgt-christopher-gilbert-et-al-o4b36000>