

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Logan Dakota Kai Blömqvist, et al. v. Extra Space Storage, Inc., et al.

Blömqvist · No. 25-cv-07867-EKL · Decided January 7, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California screened Plaintiffs’ amended complaint concerning access to storage units and related disability-discrimination allegations. The court dismissed the 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim with leave to amend, found cognizable claims under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act and 42 U.S.C. § 12203, and ordered service of the amended complaint. The court denied Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction for failure to demonstrate likely success on the merits or irreparable harm.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Eumi K. Lee
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	January 7, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-07867-EKL
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court screened plaintiffs' amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and considered plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction while defendants had not yet been served or appeared.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the court screened the IFP complaint for frivolousness, maliciousness, failure to state a claim, and claims seeking monetary relief from immune defendants. Preliminary injunctive relief required a likelihood of success on the merits and likely irreparable harm, or serious questions going to the merits with the balance of hardships tipping sharply in the movant's favor.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; generally persuasive rather than binding precedent.
PARTIES	Logan Dakota Kai Blömqvist, Todd Myers v. Extra Space Storage, Inc., Noreta Mendez, Jessica Brubaker, David Gallegos

TOPICS

injunctions

section 1983

public accommodations discrimination

ada / disability

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Americans with Disabilities Act

Civil rights

Preliminary injunctions

Real estate and landlord-tenant

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint stated a cognizable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 based on alleged cooperation or joint action between private defendants and law enforcement.
2. Whether the amended complaint stated a cognizable Title III ADA claim under 42 U.S.C. § 12181 and related provisions.
3. Whether the amended complaint stated a cognizable ADA retaliation claim under 42 U.S.C. § 12203.
4. Whether plaintiffs were entitled to a preliminary injunction requiring immediate and unrestricted access to their storage units and email-only communications.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs failed to state a § 1983 claim because they did not adequately allege an agreement, meeting of the minds, conspiracy, or joint action between defendants and law enforcement. The claim was dismissed with leave to amend, subject to a final opportunity to cure.
2. Construing the amended complaint liberally, the court found a cognizable Title III ADA claim based on the alleged refusal to accept written advocate authorization coupled with the alleged refusal to engage in the ADA interactive process.
3. The amended complaint stated a cognizable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 12203 because plaintiffs alleged that defendants retaliated within 24 hours after plaintiffs requested reasonable modifications by overlocking the units, cancelling the leases, and restricting access.
4. Plaintiffs were not entitled to a preliminary injunction because they failed to show a likelihood of success on the merits or serious questions going to the merits, and failed to demonstrate likely irreparable harm.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Plaintiffs have not satisfied the standard for obtaining the “extraordinary remedy” of a preliminary injunction.” (at 8)

“Because plaintiffs have been given access on multiple occasions to retrieve items, the Court does not find that Plaintiffs face a likelihood of irreparable harm that the Court can remedy at this stage.” (at 9)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs alleged that Extra Space Storage and its employees denied or restricted access to their storage units in Campbell and Los Gatos, California, after plaintiffs missed lease payments. Plaintiffs alleged disabilities involving PTSD and anxiety, medications stored in the units, and requests for accommodations including email-only communications, predictable access, and acceptance of written advocate authorization. They alleged that defendants placed overlocks on the units, cancelled the leases, and restricted access after plaintiffs requested ADA accommodations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs initially filed applications for in forma pauperis status and a temporary restraining order, which was denied as premature because no complaint had been filed. After plaintiffs filed a complaint, the court granted IFP status, dismissed the complaint with leave to amend, and denied a second TRO application. Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint and a third TRO application, which the court converted into a motion for preliminary injunction. The court screened the amended complaint, dismissed the § 1983 claim with leave to amend, found the ADA claims cognizable, ordered service, deferred supplemental-jurisdiction issues, and denied preliminary injunctive relief.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126-27 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)
- *Fonda v. Gray*, 707 F.2d 435, 438 (9th Cir. 1983)
- *Fortyune v. Am. Multi-Cinema, Inc.*, 364 F.3d 1075, 1082 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *Lentini v. Cal. Ctr. for the Arts, Escondido*, 370 F.3d 837, 849 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20, 24 (2008)
- *All. for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir. 2011)
- *Where Do We Go Berkeley v. Cal. Dep't of Transp.*, 32 F.4th 852, 863 (9th Cir. 2022)
- *McColm v. S.F. Hous. Auth.*, No. C 02-5810 PJH, 2007 WL