

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Luc Van Nguyen v. S. Suprovici, et al.

Luc Van Nguyen v. S. Suprovici, et al. · No. 2:24-cv-01774-EFB (PC) · Decided May 13, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants the plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court dismisses the complaint as frivolous under the prisoner-screening statutes, based on allegations it characterizes as delusional, but grants leave to amend within 30 days. The order also provides requirements for any amended complaint, including joinder, pleading, and defendant-identification rules.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Edmund F. Brennan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	May 13, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-01774-EFB (PC)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a pro se state inmate's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On prisoner screening, the court must dismiss claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. For failure to state a claim, the complaint must satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) and the plausibility standards of Twombly and Iqbal; allegations are accepted as true and construed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Luc Van Nguyen v. S. Suprovici, et al.

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

federal civil procedure

pleading and screening

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint was subject to dismissal during prisoner screening because its factual allegations were fanciful, delusional, or otherwise frivolous.
2. Whether plaintiff should receive leave to amend after dismissal.
3. What pleading, joinder, personal-participation, caption, and completeness requirements would govern any amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint was frivolous because its claims were based on fanciful, delusional, or fantastic factual allegations lacking an arguable basis in fact.
2. The complaint was dismissed with leave to file an amended complaint within 30 days to attempt to cure the identified defects.
3. Any amended complaint must state facts rather than legal conclusions, avoid unrelated claims against different defendants, identify persons who personally participated in the alleged constitutional deprivation, include a proper caption, and be complete in itself.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” (at 1)

“Plaintiff’s claims plainly fall within this category.” (at 2)

“Any amended complaint must contain facts – not legal conclusions – supporting each element of the claims alleged.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is an octogenarian Vietnamese inmate housed at California Health Care Facility. He appeared to allege that he had been poisoned multiple times and that defendant S. Suprovici, a psychiatrist, created an involuntary medication petition to conceal a plot at the facility to murder him involving the California Governor. An involuntary medication notice indicated that plaintiff had been diagnosed with delusional disorder and that Suprovici found him gravely disabled and lacking capacity to accept or refuse medications.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, a state inmate proceeding without counsel, filed a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted in forma pauperis status, screened the complaint, found the claims frivolous because they were based on fanciful or delusional factual allegations, dismissed the complaint, and granted leave to file an amended complaint within 30 days.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327-28 (1989)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 554, 555-57, 562-63, 570 (2007)
- Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41 (1957)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89 (2007)
- Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974)
- McKeever v. Block, 932 F.2d 797, 798 (9th Cir. 1991)
- George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978)
- Forsyth v. Humana, 114 F.3d 1467, 1474 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967)