

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Pearline Jackson v. The State and Federal Law Enforcement
Agencies, et al.

Jackson · No. 1:25-cv-00181-BAM (PC) · Decided November 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California recommends dismissal of Pearline Jackson’s amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint for failure to state a cognizable claim and for noncompliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8, 18, and 20. The court concludes that the pleading is vague, conclusory, improperly joins unrelated claims and defendants, and seeks relief against entities protected by immunity or not subject to liability under § 1983 or Bivens. The Findings and Recommendations allow fourteen days for objections and recommend dismissal without further leave to amend.

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	November 24, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00181-BAM (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis filed a § 1983 action. After the Court screened the original complaint and granted leave to amend, Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal without further leave to amend for failure to comply with pleading and joinder rules and failure to state a cognizable claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the Court must screen a prisoner's complaint against governmental entities or officials and dismiss it if it is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The pleading must satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and the facial-plausibility standard of Ashcroft v. Iqbal and Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Pearline Jackson v. The State and Federal Law Enforcement Agencies, et al.

TOPICS

pleadings joinder section 1983 prisoners rights eleventh amendment immunity

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights federal civil procedure constitutional law pleading and screening

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the first amended complaint complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8.
2. Whether the complaint improperly joined unrelated claims and defendants under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 18 and 20.
3. Whether the complaint stated a cognizable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or a Bivens theory against the named defendants.
4. Whether the State of California, CDCR, state prisons, state courts, federal agencies, and federal courts were immune or not proper defendants.
5. Whether Plaintiff's allegations stated cognizable claims concerning failure to protect, medical care, verbal harassment, property loss, grievance processing, access to courts, housing, investigation, and injunctive relief.
6. Whether further leave to amend should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. The first amended complaint failed to provide a short, plain, and intelligible statement showing that Plaintiff was entitled to relief because it was disjointed, vague, conclusory, and did not identify what each defendant allegedly did, when the conduct occurred, or how it violated Plaintiff's rights.
2. Plaintiff could not bring unrelated claims against unrelated parties in a single action. The claims concerning property, Social Security benefits, access to courts, medical care, and other matters were improperly joined.
3. The amended complaint failed to state a cognizable claim under § 1983 or Bivens because it did not identify specific individual conduct, alleged federal agencies and courts that were not proper § 1983 defendants, and relied on impermissible respondeat superior theories.
4. Plaintiff could not pursue claims for damages or injunctive relief against the State of California, CDCR, state prisons, state courts, or other state agencies because they are immune from suit in federal court under the Eleventh Amendment absent waiver or a valid congressional override.

5. Further leave to amend was not warranted because Plaintiff had already been informed of the pleading and legal deficiencies and had been unable to cure them in the first amended complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The complaint is disjointed, unintelligible, vague, and conclusory.” (Discussion, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8)

“Further leave to amend is not warranted.” (Conclusion and Recommendation)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff was a state prisoner housed at Central California Women's Facility and later housed at Patton State Hospital. She alleged, among other things, denial of medical and dental care, loss of property, interference with Social Security benefits, harassment and assaults by inmates, denial of access to courts, allegedly false disciplinary reports, inadequate grievance processing, surveillance, and interference with parole-related matters. She named state and federal agencies, courts, and unidentified federal agents, sought criminal charges and injunctive relief, and did not seek monetary damages.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court screened the complaint, granted leave to amend, and then screened the first amended complaint. The magistrate judge concluded that the amended complaint remained unintelligible, conclusory, improperly joined unrelated claims, and failed to state a cognizable claim; the Clerk was directed to randomly assign a district judge, and dismissal was recommended subject to objections under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 676-78 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-57 (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)
- 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)
- Fireman's Fund Insurance Co. v. City of Lodi, Cal., 302 F.3d 928, 957 n.28 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Atascadero State Hospital v. Scanlon, 473 U.S. 234, 241 (1985)
- Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388, 397 (1971)

- *Starr v. Baca*, 652 F.3d 1202, 1205-08 (9th Cir. 2011)
- *Serra v. Lappin*, 600 F.3d 1191, 1200 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Ward v. National Railroad Passenger Corp.*, 2018 WL 2966962, at *2 (E.D. Cal. June 8, 2018)
- *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 833-37, 847 (1994)
- *Jett v. Penner*, 439 F.3d 1091, 1096 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104-06 (1976)
- *Simmons v. Navajo County, Arizona*, 609 F.3d 1011, 1019 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1060 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *Broughton v. Cutter Laboratories*, 622 F.2d 458, 460 (9th Cir. 1980)
- *Wood v. Housewright*, 900 F.2d 1332, 1334 (9th Cir. 1990)
- *Keenan v. Hall*, 83 F.3d 1083, 1092 (9th Cir. 1996)
- *Gaut v. Sunn*, 810 F.2d 923, 925 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Freeman v. Arpaio*, 125 F.3d 732, 738 (9th Cir. 1997)
- *Oltarzewski v. Ruggiero*, 830 F.2d 136, 139 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Shakur v. Schriro*, 514 F.3d 878 (9th Cir. 2008)
- *Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517, 532 n.13, 533 (1984)
- *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.*, 455 U.S. 422, 435-36 (1982)
- *Quick v. Jones*, 754 F.2d 1521, 1524 (9th Cir. 1985)
- *Barnett v. Centoni*, 31 F.3d 813, 816-17 (9th Cir. 1994)
- *Ramirez v. Galaza*, 334 F.3d 850, 860 (9th Cir. 2003)
- *Mann v. Adams*, 855 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1988)
- *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 346, 348-54 (1996)
- *Christopher v. Harbury*, 536 U.S. 403, 415 (2002)
- *Nevada Department of Corrections v. Greene*, 648 F.3d 1014, 1018 (9th Cir. 2011)
- *Montayne v. Haymes*, 427 U.S. 236, 242 (1976)
- *King v. Lemos*, 2021 WL 2038187, at *6 (E.D. Cal. May 21, 2021)
- *Gomez v. Whitney*, 757 F.2d 1005, 1006 (9th Cir. 1985)
- *Page v. Stanley*, 2013 WL 2456798, at *8-9 (C.D. Cal. June 5, 2013)
- *Ellis v. County of Kern*, 2023 WL 7005188, at *5 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2023)
- *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)
- *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000)
- *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)
- *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)