

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Michael Manjeet Singh v. Warden Pheiffer, et al.

Singh v. Pheiffer · No. 1:22-cv-01412-KES-EPG (PC) · Decided June 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California converts Defendants’ partial motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s state-law claims under the California Government Claims Act into a motion for summary judgment. The court gives the parties 30 days to submit additional argument or evidence, provides notice of the requirements for opposing summary judgment, and permits a request for discovery-related abeyance.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	June 30, 2025
DOCKET	1:22-cv-01412-KES-EPG (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants moved to partially dismiss Plaintiff’s state-law claims for failure to comply with the California Government Claims Act. The court converted the motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(d) because both parties submitted and relied on materials outside the pleadings.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A Rule 12(b)(6) motion generally tests the legal sufficiency of the complaint and ordinarily is limited to the pleadings, subject to incorporation by reference and judicial-notice exceptions. When matters outside the pleadings are presented and not excluded, the court may convert the motion to one for summary judgment under Rule 12(d), provided the parties receive notice and an adequate opportunity to respond. The notice requirements are strictly applied when the nonmoving party is proceeding pro se.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district-court order; precedential status unknown.

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

summary judgment

civil procedure

judicial notice

evidence

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

prisoner civil rights

summary judgment practice

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should consider documents outside the pleadings in resolving Defendants' Rule 12(b)(6) motion.
2. Whether the partial motion to dismiss should be converted into a motion for summary judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(d).
3. What notice and opportunity to respond must be provided to a pro se prisoner after conversion to summary judgment.

HOLDINGS

1. When both parties rely on documents outside the complaint to resolve a factual and legal issue, and the issue cannot be determined from the face of the complaint, the court may properly convert the Rule 12(b)(6) motion into a motion for summary judgment under Rule 12(d), rather than exclude the extrinsic materials.
2. Before summary judgment may be entered against a party, the party must receive notice that the motion is pending and an adequate opportunity to respond, including sufficient time for necessary discovery; these notice requirements must be strictly followed when the nonmoving party is appearing pro se.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Before summary judgment may be entered against a party, that party must be afforded both notice that the motion is pending and an adequate opportunity to respond.” (at 2)

“Given that the legal issue is briefed in the parties’ submissions, and that both parties ask the Court consider documents submitted, and considering that neither party has asked for an opportunity to take further discovery on this issue, the Court finds that conversion to a motion for summary judgment is proper.” (at 3)

“Generally, summary judgment must be granted when there is no genuine issue of material fact— that is, if there is no real dispute about any fact that would affect the result of your case, the party who asked for summary judgment is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, which will result in dismissal of certain claims in your case.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a California state prisoner, asserted federal Eighth Amendment claims and state-law claims for negligent failure to protect and failure to summon medical care. Defendants argued that the state-law claims were barred because Plaintiff failed to comply with the California Government Claims Act, relying on a letter stating that his claim lacked the required \$25 filing fee or fee waiver. Plaintiff submitted a copy of a \$25 check

and evidence that the State deposited it, creating an issue that could not be resolved from the face of the complaint alone.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants filed a partial motion to dismiss on September 27, 2024, supported by a request for judicial notice. Plaintiff opposed and filed his own request for judicial notice, including a copy of a \$25 check allegedly paid to the Government Claims Program. After further briefing, the court converted the motion to a motion for summary judgment and gave both parties 30 days to submit additional briefing or evidence, with an alternative opportunity to request discovery and abeyance.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Navarro v. Block, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Jones v. Bock, 549 U.S. 199, 215, 127 S. Ct. 910, 921, 166 L. Ed. 2d 798 (2007)
- El-Shaddai v. Zamora, 833 F.3d 1036, 1044 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Thompson v. Drug Enf't Admin., 492 F.3d 428, 438 (D.C. Cir. 2007)
- Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Crest Group, Inc., 499 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2007)
- Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc., 899 F.3d 988, 998 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Jones v. L.A. Cent. Plaza LLC, 74 F.4th 1053, 1059 (9th Cir. 2023)
- Anderson v. Angelone, 86 F.3d 932, 934 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Portland Retail Druggists Ass'n v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, 662 F.2d 641, 645 (9th Cir. 1981)
- Garaux v. Pulley, 739 F.2d 437, 439-40 (9th Cir. 1984)
- Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998)