

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Walker v. Adams

Case No. 5:24-cv-08901 EJD (PR) (N.D. Cal. Aug. 5, 2025) · No. 5:24-cv-08901 EJD (PR) · Decided August 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California grants Plaintiff Jeffery Walker’s request to strike deficient claims and permits the action to proceed on specified Fourteenth Amendment due process and medical-care claims. The order directs service on the remaining defendants, establishes deadlines for dispositive motions and briefing, and instructs the plaintiff to identify the Doe defendants through discovery. All other claims and defendants are stricken or terminated.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Edward J. Davila
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	August 5, 2025
DOCKET	5:24-cv-08901 EJD (PR)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983; after screening the complaint and granting leave to amend, the court granted Plaintiff's request to strike deficient claims and directed the case to proceed on specified cognizable claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must screen a prisoner or detainee civil-rights complaint and identify claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. Pro se pleadings are liberally construed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district-court order; precedential status not stated in the opinion.
PARTIES	Jeffery Walker v. Chief Adams, Quantico, Rold, Collins, Johnson, Miyamoto, Main, Asa, Baker, Jane Doe Defendants

TOPICS

section 1983 due process civil rights pleadings civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights constitutional law prisoner and civil detainee litigation federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's request to strike deficient claims and proceed on the claims previously identified as cognizable should be granted despite being filed late.
2. Which claims and defendants remained in the action after the deficient claims were stricken.
3. Whether the remaining due-process and deficient-medical-care claims were cognizable under the Fourteenth Amendment for a civil detainee.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted Plaintiff's late request to strike the deficient claims and proceed on the previously identified cognizable claims.
2. The due-process claim against Quantico and Rold for subjecting Plaintiff, a civil detainee, to punitive or restrictive conditions of confinement at CJ3 was cognizable and could proceed.
3. The deficient-medical-care claims against Main, Asa, Baker, and the medical Jane Doe defendants were cognizable and could proceed under the Fourteenth Amendment rather than the Eighth Amendment.
4. The claims against the medical Jane Doe defendants could proceed temporarily if Plaintiff identified them through discovery and timely moved to substitute their proper names.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A federal court must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity." (at 2)

"To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law." (at 2)

"This action shall proceed solely on the above identified cognizable claims, and all other claims and defendants shall be STRICKEN from the complaint." (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jeffery Walker was a civil detainee held at the San Francisco County Jail and was transferred to the County Jail in San Bruno. He alleged that the latter facility did not house civil detainees and that his transfer and restrictive housing were retaliatory and punitive despite officials' knowledge of his status. He also alleged that medical personnel denied him medical accommodations and treatment, including Lidocaine patches and ointment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a § 1983 complaint while detained at the San Francisco County Jail. On May 22, 2025, the court screened the complaint, identified deficiencies, granted leave to amend, and alternatively permitted Plaintiff to strike the deficient claims and proceed on cognizable claims. Plaintiff filed a late request to strike the deficient claims, which the court granted, and the court directed service and set a schedule for dispositive motions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Department*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990)
- *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988)
- *Jones*, 393 F.3d at 932
- *Gillespie v. Civiletti*, 629 F.2d 637, 642 (9th Cir. 1980)
- *Rand v. Rowland*, 154 F.3d 952, 963 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc)
- *Woods v. Carey*, 684 F.3d 934, 940 (9th Cir. 2012)
- *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317 (1986)
- *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam)
- *Brydges v. Lewis*, 18 F.3d 651, 653 (9th Cir. 1994)