

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

William H. Brandstatt v. Clark, et al.

Brandstatt v. Clark · No. 1:21-cv-01600-KES-BAM (PC) · Decided November 20, 2025

SUMMARY

The document contains a magistrate judge’s Findings and Recommendations in a prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. It recommends dismissal with prejudice for failure to state a claim, failure to obey a court order, and failure to prosecute after the plaintiff failed to file a second amended complaint or otherwise respond to the court’s screening order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Barbara A. McAuliffe, United States Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	November 20, 2025
DOCKET	1:21-cv-01600-KES-BAM (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Findings and recommendations by a magistrate judge recommending dismissal with prejudice of a prisoner's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for failure to state a claim, failure to obey a court order, and failure to prosecute.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the pleading-plausibility standard under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and Ashcroft v. Iqbal, and considered the Ninth Circuit's factors governing dismissal for failure to prosecute or obey a court order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge in a district court action, with no reported citation.
PARTIES	William H. Brandstatt v. K. Clark, A. Mehta, M. Gamboa, Lirones, Celia Bell, T. Campbell

TOPICS

- sanctions
- pleadings
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the first amended complaint failed to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and state a plausible claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
2. Whether Plaintiff's supervisory-liability allegations were insufficient because they relied on respondeat superior rather than personal participation, direction, knowledge, or a constitutionally deficient policy.
3. Whether the first amended complaint improperly joined unrelated claims and defendants under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 18 and 20.
4. Whether dismissal with prejudice was warranted because Plaintiff failed to obey the court's order and failed to prosecute the action.

HOLDINGS

1. A prisoner's complaint must provide a short, plain, simple, concise, and direct statement containing sufficient factual matter to state a facially plausible claim; conclusory allegations and threadbare recitals are insufficient.
2. Supervisory personnel may not be held liable under section 1983 solely because of their positions or under a respondeat superior theory; liability requires personal participation or direction, knowledge of violations coupled with failure to act, a qualifying causal connection, or implementation of a constitutionally deficient policy that is the moving force of the violation.
3. Unrelated claims against unrelated defendants may not be joined in one action; joinder under Rule 20 requires that the right to relief arise from the same transaction or occurrence and involve a common question of law or fact, after which Rule 18 permits multiple claims against a properly joined party.
4. A district court may dismiss an action with prejudice for failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules after considering the relevant dismissal factors, including the public interest in expeditious resolution, docket management, prejudice, disposition on the merits, and availability of less drastic sanctions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"In short, the FAC consists neither of "short and plain" statements of Plaintiff's claims, nor are the allegations in it "simple, concise and direct" as Rule 8 requires." (at 5)

"Liability may not be imposed on supervisory personnel for the actions or omissions of their subordinates under the theory of respondeat superior." (at 6)

"Plaintiff may not bring unrelated claims against unrelated parties in a single action." (at 7)

"Accordingly, the Court finds that dismissal is the appropriate sanction and HEREBY RECOMMENDS that this action be dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state a claim, for failure to obey a court order, and for Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action." (at 9)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. His first amended complaint asserted claims concerning COVID-19 exposure, medical prescriptions and treatment, dental floss, a pillow, prison grievance procedures, access to courts, and legal mail against employees of California State Prison–Corcoran. After the court found the amended complaint deficient and granted extensions to permit amendment or another response, Plaintiff failed to comply with the court's October 10, 2025 order or otherwise communicate with the court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint asserting multiple constitutional and medical-care-related claims. On August 27, 2025, the court screened the amended complaint, found that it failed to state a claim, and granted leave to amend or otherwise respond. After granting extensions on September 11 and October 10, 2025, the court warned that noncompliance could result in dismissal. Plaintiff filed neither a second amended complaint nor another response, prompting these findings and recommendations.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The magistrate judge recommended dismissal with prejudice. The findings and recommendations were to be submitted to the assigned United States district judge, with the parties given fourteen days to file objections.

CASES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)
- Doe I v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 572 F.3d 677, 681 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Moss v. U.S. Secret Service, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Knapp v. Hogan, 738 F.3d 1106, 1108-09 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Simmons v. Navajo County, Arizona, 609 F.3d 1011, 1020-21 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Ewing v. City of Stockton, 588 F.3d 1218, 1235 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Jones v. Williams, 297 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Taylor v. List, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Starr v. Baca, 652 F.3d 1202, 1205-06 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Corales v. Bennett, 567 F.3d 554, 570 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Redman v. County of San Diego, 942 F.2d 1435, 1446 (9th Cir. 1991)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825 (1970)
- Fayle v. Stapley, 607 F.2d 858, 862 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Mosher v. Saalfeld, 589 F.2d 438, 441 (9th Cir. 1978)

- Ivey v. Board of Regents, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- Owens v. Hinsley, 635 F.3d 950, 952 (7th Cir. 2011)
- George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Coughlin v. Rogers, 130 F.3d 1348, 1349, 1351 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Thompson v. Housing Authority, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-62 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Malone v. United States Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130-33 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423-24 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976)
- Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 643 (9th Cir. 2002)
- In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation, 460 F.3d 1217, 1228 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)