

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Julia Teryaeva-Reed v. Pamela Bondi, et al.

Case No. 25-cv-09887-JST (PR) · No. 25-cv-09887-JST (PR) · Decided December 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismisses Julia Teryaeva-Reed’s pro se civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, with leave to amend. The court denies requests for appointment of counsel and stay or abeyance, and directs Plaintiff to file an amended complaint and provide a current address and notice of intent to prosecute.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jon S. Tigar
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	December 8, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-09887-JST (PR)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se prisoner civil-rights action screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A before service of process.
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, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. Pro se pleadings are liberally construed, but they must comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) and other applicable pleading and joinder requirements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Julia Teryaeva-Reed v. Pamela Bondi, et al.

TOPICS

- pleadings
- civil procedure
- joinder
- venue
- immigration detention

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2)'s short-and-plain-statement requirement.
2. Whether the complaint improperly joined unrelated claims and defendants under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20(a)(2).
3. Whether claims arising from events at FDC Miami were properly venued in the Northern District of California.
4. Whether the claim concerning plaintiff's transfer from FCI-Dublin to FDC Miami was duplicative and subject to dismissal as malicious under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.
5. Whether plaintiff was entitled to appointment of counsel or a stay and abeyance.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to comply with Rule 8(a)(2) because its lengthy, repetitive, and confusing narrative did not provide a short and plain statement of the claims.
2. The complaint appeared to violate Rule 20(a)(2) by combining unrelated claims against different defendants arising from different occurrences and lacking a common question of law or fact.
3. To the extent plaintiff sought relief for claims arising from events at FDC Miami, the proper venue appeared to be the Southern District of Florida rather than the Northern District of California.
4. The claim that plaintiff was improperly transferred from FCI-Dublin to FDC Miami was duplicative because it had been raised and rejected in a prior action, and duplicative litigation may be dismissed as malicious under § 1915.
5. The court denied plaintiff's request for appointed counsel because she did not establish exceptional circumstances.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.”” (Discussion A)

“Failure to comply with Rule 8 is an independent basis for dismissal separate from whether the plaintiff states a sufficient claim on the merits.” (Discussion C)

“The Court DISMISSES the complaint with leave to amend.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged mistreatment and unconstitutional conditions of confinement during her incarceration at FCI-Aliceville in Alabama, FDC Miami in Florida, and FCI-Dublin in California, with the allegations focused primarily on FDC Miami. She also alleged that transfers between institutions violated federal policies and court orders, were retaliatory, and caused her to serve a sentence longer than necessary. The complaint asserted claims

under federal law, California and Texas law, and various federal-agency policies. Plaintiff had been removed from the United States by the time of the order and had not provided the court with a current address.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an 87-page civil-rights complaint naming fifteen defendants and was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis in a separate order. The court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, dismissed it for pleading, joinder, venue, and duplicative-litigation deficiencies, and granted leave to amend. The court also denied plaintiff's requests for appointment of counsel and stay and abeyance.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint within twenty-eight days, using the case caption and number, identifying each wrongful act, date, conduct, defendant, and violated federal law or constitutional provision. Plaintiff must also provide her current address and state whether she intends to prosecute the action within twenty-eight days.

CASES CITED

- United States v. Qazi, 975 F.3d 989, 993 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677–78 (2009)
- McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1177, 1179 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Washington, 350 F.3d 925, 929 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Romano v. U.S. Army Core of Eng'rs, Case No. 17-cv-930-JD, 2017 WL 6448221, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2017)
- George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Teryaeva-Reed v. Peters, et al., Case No. 24-cv-3910-JSW
- Bailey v. Johnson, 846 F.2d 1019, 1021 (5th Cir. 1988)
- Cato v. United States, 70 F.3d 1103, 1105 n.2 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Lassiter v. Dep't of Social Svcs., 452 U.S. 18, 25 (1981)
- Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Agyeman v. Corrections Corp. of America, 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Teryaeva-Reed v. Larose, Case No. 25-cv-02219-AGS-JLB, ECF No. 22
- Lacey v. Maricopa Cty., 693 F.3d 896, 925 (9th Cir. 2012)