

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Jose Alba v. State of Arizona, et al.

No. CV-23-01419-PHX-MTL (ASB), United States District Court for the District of Arizona (March 31, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona grants summary judgment in favor of Maricopa County under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f)(1) on Plaintiff Jose Alba’s remaining claims. The court concludes that Alba’s detention after sentencing was lawful because outstanding bonds in two prior criminal cases remained valid, and rejects his arguments that the bonds had been extinguished or that he was entitled to a new bond hearing. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment and terminate the action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael T. Liburdi
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	March 31, 2026
DOCKET	CV-23-01419-PHX-MTL (ASB)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After granting summary judgment to the State, the City, Officer Sean Ryan, and the Sheriffs, the court issued an order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f)(1) requiring Plaintiff to show cause why the remaining claims against Maricopa County should not also be dismissed. The court granted summary judgment for the County and terminated the action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is proper when the material facts are not genuinely disputed and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f)(1), the court may grant summary judgment to a nonmovant or on its own after identifying potentially undisputed material facts, provided the affected party receives notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Jose Alba v. State of Arizona, City of Scottsdale, Sean Ryan, Maricopa County, Paul Penzone, Jerry Sheridan

TOPICS

summary judgment

section 1983

due process

civil rights

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

civil procedure

constitutional law

criminal procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court could grant summary judgment to Maricopa County under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f)(1) after giving Alba notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond.
2. Whether Alba's continued detention after his November 3, 2022 sentencing was unlawful when valid bond orders in his 2018 and 2019 criminal cases remained outstanding.
3. Whether exoneration of the sureties' bonds vacated or eliminated the underlying bond orders and entitled Alba to new bond hearings.
4. Whether Alba could establish false imprisonment or a Fourteenth Amendment due-process violation against Maricopa County.

HOLDINGS

1. The court could grant summary judgment to Maricopa County because it identified the potentially undisputed material facts, gave Alba notice through the order to show cause, and provided him a reasonable opportunity to respond.
2. Alba's detention after November 3, 2022 was not unlawful because valid bond orders in his 2018 and 2019 criminal cases remained outstanding and had to be paid before his release.
3. Exoneration released the sureties from their obligations and returned the security; it did not vacate or eliminate the bond orders governing Alba's release in the 2018 and 2019 cases.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Rule 56(f)(1) provides that a court may “(1) grant summary judgment for a nonmovant; (2) grant the motion on grounds not raised by a party; or (3) consider summary judgment on its own after identifying for the parties material facts that may not be genuinely in dispute,” so long as the Court first “giv[es] notice and a reasonable time to respond.”” (at 2)

“When Plaintiff went into pretrial custody on the 2020 case, he was not relieved from having to pay the bonds ordered in his prior cases; rather, the sureties (bail bondsmen) in the 2018 and 2019 cases were exonerated, i.e., released from their obligation, because there was no further need for a bond with Plaintiff in custody.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Alba was sentenced on November 3, 2022, to two years and four months in prison in a 2020 criminal case, with credit for approximately two years and eight months of pretrial detention. Although the sentencing court ordered that he be transported to the Arizona Department of Corrections for processing and release, Alba remained in the

Maricopa County Jail until February 6, 2023. The court determined that the Arizona Department of Corrections hold should have been lifted earlier, but also determined that Alba could not have been released because valid bond orders in his 2018 and 2019 criminal cases remained outstanding and had to be satisfied. Alba argued that exoneration of the earlier bonds eliminated the bond orders and entitled him to a new bond hearing.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff initially filed this civil-rights and state-law action in Maricopa County Superior Court, and the State removed it to federal court. Plaintiff asserted claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and state law arising from his detention after sentencing in a criminal case. The court previously granted summary judgment to several defendants and concluded that the detention was lawful because outstanding bonds in two earlier criminal matters remained valid. After providing notice and an opportunity to respond under Rule 56(f)(1), the court granted summary judgment to the remaining defendant, Maricopa County.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Gant v. City of Los Angeles*, 772 F.3d 608, 620 (9th Cir. 2014)
- *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 683 (9th Cir. 2001)
- *Greene v. Solano Cnty. Jail*, 513 F.3d 982, 990 (9th Cir. 2008)
- *Mundt v. United States*, 611 F.2d 1257, 1259 (9th Cir. 1980)
- *Frantz C. v. Shanahan*, No. 18-CV-2043 (JLL), 2018 WL 3302998, at *2-3 (D.N.J. July 5, 2018)
- *Motorola, Inc. v. J.B. Rodgers Mech. Contractors*, 215 F.R.D. 581, 582-83, 586 (D. Ariz. 2003)
- *United States v. Torres*, 807 F.3d 257, 261 (7th Cir. 2015)