

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Forgan v. Tuolumne County Jail

Forgan · No. 2:25-cv-1325-JDP (P) · Decided August 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California dismissed plaintiff Daniel J. Forgan’s amended complaint with leave to amend because it combined multiple unrelated claims against numerous defendants. The court granted one final opportunity to file a second amended complaint separating the claims and warned that failure to comply could result in a recommendation of dismissal with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 5, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-1325-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court screened plaintiff's amended pro se prisoner civil-rights complaint and dismissed it with leave to amend because it improperly joined unrelated claims against multiple defendants.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the statutory screening standard under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) and the pleading plausibility standard under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- pleadings
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights
- section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint impermissibly joined multiple unrelated claims against multiple defendants.
2. Whether the complaint satisfied the federal pleading and screening requirements.
3. Whether plaintiff should be granted leave to amend after dismissal of the amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint may not combine multiple unrelated claims against more than one defendant in a single action; plaintiff's claims concerning diet and medical treatment were not legally or factually related to his claims concerning legal copies and law-library access.
2. A complaint subject to screening may be dismissed if it is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant; it must also contain a short and plain statement showing entitlement to relief and enough factual matter to state a plausible claim.
3. The amended complaint was dismissed with leave to amend, and plaintiff was given thirty days to file a further amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Multiple, unrelated claims against more than one defendant belong in separate suits.” (at 1)

“Plaintiff's amended complaint, ECF No. 8, is DISMISSED with leave to amend.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that the Calaveras County Adult Detention Facility did not provide him with a Kosher diet. He also alleged that medical personnel placed him on a pureed-food diet because of difficulty swallowing associated with a hiatal hernia, resulting in the loss of some commissary items. Separately, he alleged that he was denied legal copies and law-library access at the Calaveras County facility, Tuolumne County Jail, and Napa State Hospital.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an action against numerous defendants associated with the Calaveras County Adult Detention Facility and Tuolumne County Jail. The court stated that plaintiff's amended complaint, like his prior complaint, combined unrelated claims. The court dismissed the amended complaint without prejudice and granted plaintiff one final opportunity to amend or voluntarily dismiss the action.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009)
- Kobold v. Good Samaritan Reg'l Med. Ctr., 832 F.3d 1024, 1038 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Nagrampa v. MailCoups, Inc., 469 F.3d 1257, 1264 n.2 (9th Cir. 2006) (en banc)
- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972) (per curiam)
- Hayes v. Idaho Corr. Ctr., 849 F.3d 1204, 1208 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Bruns v. Nat'l Credit Union Admin., 122 F.3d 1251, 1257 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Ivey v. Bd. of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Lacey v. Maricopa County, 693 F.3d 896, 907 n.1 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc)