

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Jane Doe (J.R.F.) v. Jinbo, LLC

Case No. 3:24-cv-00291-SLG (D. Alaska May 7, 2026) · No. 3:24-cv-00291-SLG · Decided May 7, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Alaska grants Defendant Jinbo, LLC’s motion to dismiss claims brought under the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act. The court holds that the claims are time-barred to the extent based on conduct before December 31, 2014, rejects application of the continuing violation doctrine, and finds the complaint insufficiently alleges equitable tolling or delayed accrual under the discovery rule. The dismissal is granted with leave to amend within 30 days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Alaska
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sharon L. Gleason
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Alaska
DECIDED	May 7, 2026
DOCKET	3:24-cv-00291-SLG
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss Plaintiff's claims under the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act. The court granted the motion with leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true and determines whether the complaint contains sufficient factual matter to state a plausible claim for relief. Conclusory allegations and legal conclusions pleaded as facts are not accepted as true.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district-court order
PARTIES	Jane Doe (J.R.F.) v. Jinbo, LLC, doing business as Royal Suites Lodge

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- statute of limitations
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

statute of limitations

human trafficking

torts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the TVPRA's ten-year statute of limitations barred claims based on alleged trafficking conduct occurring before December 31, 2014.
2. Whether the continuing violation or continuing tort doctrine allowed Plaintiff to treat repeated trafficking-related conduct as one continuing actionable violation.
3. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged a timely TVPRA claim based on conduct occurring on December 31, 2014.
4. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged facts supporting equitable tolling.
5. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged a self-concealing injury warranting application of the discovery rule.
6. Whether dismissal should be with leave to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. Under 18 U.S.C. § 1595(c), a TVPRA action must generally be initiated no later than the latter of ten years after the cause of action arose or ten years after the victim reached eighteen years of age if she was a minor when the offense occurred. Because the complaint did not allege that Plaintiff turned eighteen after December 31, 2014, claims based on conduct before that date were time-barred unless an exception applied.
2. The continuing violation or continuing tort doctrine does not apply to Plaintiff's TVPRA claims because each alleged act of sex trafficking at the hotel constitutes a discrete, actionable tort, and the repetition of such conduct does not prevent the limitations period from running separately for each act.
3. The complaint did not plausibly state a TVPRA claim based on conduct occurring on December 31, 2014 because it did not specifically allege that trafficking occurred at the hotel on that date or identify wrongful conduct by Defendant on that particular day.
4. The complaint did not plausibly allege facts showing that Plaintiff diligently pursued her rights and that extraordinary circumstances prevented timely filing, as required for equitable tolling.
5. The court did not decide whether the discovery rule applies to TVPRA claims, but held that Plaintiff's complaint failed to plausibly allege a self-concealing injury that would trigger the rule.
6. Dismissal was granted with leave to amend because amendment was not shown to be futile, and there was no evidence of bad faith, undue delay, or prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Rather, each alleged act of sex trafficking at the Royal Suites Lodge constitutes a discrete, actionable tort.”
(Discussion)

“The Court thus finds that Plaintiff’s Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief could be granted.”
(Discussion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that she was sex trafficked at various times from 2003 through December 2014, including at rooms in Defendant's Royal Suites Lodge in Anchorage, Alaska. She alleged that her trafficker used coercion and physical violence, and that hotel staff ignored indicators of trafficking, including repeated short-term visits by men, unusual hours, and the trafficker's presence at check-in or nearby. Plaintiff asserted TVPRA perpetrator and beneficiary liability and alleged that the discovery rule, equitable tolling, and continuing-tort doctrine preserved her claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on December 31, 2024, alleging that Defendant facilitated her sex trafficking and asserted perpetrator and beneficiary liability under the TVPRA. Defendant moved to dismiss, Plaintiff opposed, and Defendant replied. The court granted dismissal because the claims were facially untimely to the extent based on pre-December 31, 2014 conduct and the complaint did not plausibly state a timely claim for conduct on December 31, 2014, but allowed Plaintiff 30 days to amend.

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No appellate remand was ordered. Defendant's motion to dismiss was granted, with Plaintiff permitted to file a First Amended Complaint within 30 days. Defendants must answer or otherwise respond within 21 days after the FAC is filed; failure to file an FAC within 30 days will result in dismissal of the action for failure to state a claim.

CASES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- In re Tracht Gut, LLC, 836 F.3d 1146, 1150 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Gordon v. City of Oakland, 627 F.3d 1092, 1094 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Albrecht v. Lund, 845 F.2d 193, 195 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Schreiber Distributing Co. v. Serv-Well Furniture Co., 806 F.2d 1393, 1401 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Doe A. v. Seatac Hotels LLC, Case No. C24-1270 MJP, 2025 WL 474233, at *6 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 12, 2025)
- A.B. v. Interstate Management Co., LLC, Case No. 3:23-cv-00388-IM, 2024 WL 5264652, at *3-*4 (D. Or. Dec. 31, 2024)
- Schneider v. OSG, LLC, Case No. 22-cv-7686, 2024 WL 1308690, at *5 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 27, 2024)

- J.M. v. Choice Hotels International, Inc., Case No. 2:22-cv-00672-KJM-JDP, 2022 WL 10626493, at *6 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 18, 2022)
- Headley v. Church of Scientology International, Case No. CV 09-3987 DSF, 2009 WL 10671965, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2009)
- Doe v. G6 Hosp., LLC, Case No. 2:24-cv-01235-RSL, 2025 WL 1167550, at *4-*5 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 22, 2025)
- Morgan v. National Railroad Passenger Corp., 232 F.3d 1008, 1016 (9th Cir. 2000), aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 536 U.S. 101 (2002)
- Gutowsky v. County of Placer, 108 F.3d 256, 259 (9th Cir. 1997)
- National Railroad Passenger Corp. v. Morgan, 536 U.S. 101, 114 (2002)
- Bird v. Department of Human Services, 935 F.3d 738, 746-48 (9th Cir. 2019)
- Doe v. Six Continents Hotels Inc., Case No. CV 24-11219-MWF, 2025 WL 2020003, at *5 (C.D. Cal. June 26, 2025)
- Christina T. v. Bellagio LLC, Case No. 2:25-CV-145 JCM (DJA), 2025 WL 2962780, at *3 (D. Nev. Oct. 17, 2025)
- Marcy C. v. MGM Resorts International, Case No. 2:24-cv-2027 JCM (MDC), 2025 WL 3187434, at *3 (D. Nev. Nov. 13, 2025)
- Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin v. United States, 577 U.S. 250, 255 (2016)
- Holland v. Florida, 560 U.S. 631, 649 (2010)
- Smith v. Davis, 953 F.3d 582, 599-600 (9th Cir. 2020) (en banc)
- C.C. v. Rashid, Case No. 2:23-cv-02056-GMN-BNW, 2025 WL 1785273, at *5 (D. Nev. June 26, 2025)
- Gabelli v. SEC, 568 U.S. 442, 449-50 (2013)
- Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1051-52 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Owens v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., 244 F.3d 708, 712 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962)
- Sonoma County Association of Retired Employees v. Sonoma County, 708 F.3d 1109, 1117 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Sharkey v. O'Neal, 778 F.3d 767, 774 (9th Cir. 2015)