

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON,
EUGENE DIVISION

Logan Martin Isaac v. James Ivory Manning, Jr., Shelly Boshart
Davis, Renee Perry, and John and Jane Does 1–10

Isaac · No. 6:25-cv-01159-MC · Decided January 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon screens Logan Martin Isaac’s Second Amended Complaint alleging First Amendment retaliation, Fourteenth Amendment procedural due process violations, and conspiracy arising from restrictions on his access to the Oregon Capitol and legislative actions concerning proposed bills. The court concludes that Senator Manning and Representative Davis are entitled to legislative immunity for conduct related to legislative proceedings, while claims concerning Capitol access restrictions may minimally survive screening against Representative Davis, Renee Perry, and Doe defendants. The court dismisses all claims against Senator Manning without leave to amend and permits prospective injunctive-relief claims under Ex parte Young concerning ongoing Capitol access restrictions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon, Eugene Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael J. McShane
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon, Eugene Division
DECIDED	January 22, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-01159-MC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a self-represented plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the court screens an in forma pauperis complaint for frivolousness, maliciousness, failure to state a claim, and claims seeking monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court applies the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) standard and liberally construes pleadings filed by self-represented plaintiffs.

TOPICS

civil procedure

first amendment

procedural due process

section 1983

injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

constitutional law

federal civil procedure

legislative immunity

injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Senator Manning's refusal to schedule a legislative hearing was protected legislative conduct subject to absolute legislative immunity under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
2. Whether Isaac plausibly stated First Amendment retaliation, Fourteenth Amendment procedural due process, and civil-rights conspiracy claims based on restrictions on his access to the Capitol and Representative Davis's office.
3. Whether Isaac plausibly stated a claim for prospective injunctive relief under *Ex parte Young* based on allegedly ongoing enforcement of the access restrictions.
4. Whether the claims against Senator Manning should be dismissed without leave to amend because the defects could not be cured by amendment.

HOLDINGS

1. Senator Manning's decision not to schedule a hearing on SB 1057 was a legislative act protected by absolute legislative immunity, even if the decision was allegedly motivated by retaliation against Isaac.
2. Isaac's claims against Senator Manning, and his claims against Representative Davis to the extent based on legislative conduct involving cancellation of a hearing on SJM1, were barred by legislative immunity.
3. Isaac's allegations were minimally sufficient at the screening stage to proceed on First Amendment retaliation, Fourteenth Amendment procedural due process, and conspiracy claims against Representative Davis, Renee Perry, and the Doe defendants, including Brett Hanes, insofar as the claims concerned restrictions on access to the Capitol or Davis's office.
4. Isaac plausibly stated a claim for prospective injunctive relief against Representative Davis and Doe defendants to prevent ongoing enforcement of the alleged Capitol and office access restrictions.
5. *Ex parte Young* does not authorize retrospective money damages against state officials or adjudication of the legality of past conduct.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Courts must be extremely careful that considerations of a legislator's motive do not infect the determination of whether an act is legislative." (Discussion I.A)

"Because they have now been dismissed twice in this case and it is clear they cannot be cured by amendment, Plaintiff's claims against Senator Manning are DISMISSED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND." (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Isaac, a disabled Army veteran, advocated for Oregon legislation concerning military civil rights and visited Representative Shelly Boshart Davis's office to discuss proposed legislation. After an exchange in which Isaac referred to veteran suicides and said his next stop would be a local newspaper, Davis banned him from her office and a legislative administrator imposed Capitol-wide access restrictions requiring advance notice and an escort. Isaac also alleged that Senator James Manning refused to schedule a hearing on a bill after Isaac confronted a legislative aide, and he characterized the access restrictions and legislative decisions as retaliation for his advocacy.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Isaac filed an original complaint and a First Amended Complaint while proceeding in forma pauperis. The court screened the First Amended Complaint and found it subject to partial dismissal, after which Isaac filed the Second Amended Complaint. On screening the Second Amended Complaint, the court dismissed all claims against Senator Manning without leave to amend but allowed the remaining claims against Representative Davis, Renee Perry, and Doe defendants to proceed past screening in specified respects.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- O’Neal v. Price, 531 F.3d 1146, 1151 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Karim-Panahi v. Los Angeles Police Department, 839 F.2d 621, 623, 626 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Watison v. Carter, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Kaahumanu v. County of Maui, 315 F.3d 1215, 1219–20 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Jones v. Allison, 9 F.4th 1136, 1140 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Bogan v. Scott-Harris, 523 U.S. 44, 55 (1998)
- Community House, Inc. v. City of Boise, 623 F.3d 945, 964 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Kuzinich v. Santa Clara County, 689 F.2d 1345, 1347–49 (9th Cir. 1982)
- Reza v. Pearce, 2012 WL 1392991, at *2 (D. Ariz. Apr. 23, 2012)
- Selene v. Legislature of Idaho, 514 F. Supp. 3d 1243, 1253 (D. Idaho 2021)
- Tenney v. Brandhove, 341 U.S. 367, 377 (1951)
- Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123, 149–57 (1908)
- Idaho v. Coeur d’Alene Tribe of Idaho, 521 U.S. 261, 281 (1997)
- Arizona Students’ Association v. Arizona Board of Regents, 824 F.3d 858, 864–65 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Frew ex rel. Frew v. Hawkins, 540 U.S. 431, 437 (2004)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126–30 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)
- Cato v. United States, 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995)

- *Hafer v. Melo*, 502 U.S. 21, 25 (1991)
- *Monell v. Department of Social Services of the City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658, 690 & n.55 (1978)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-oregon-euge/2026/logan-martin-isaac-v-james-ivory-manning-jr-shelly-boshart-t2tjrwk0>