

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

Daniel Keith Wilson v. M. De Arton, et al.

Wilson v. De Arton · No. 2:25-cv-2984-DC-JDP (PS) · Decided December 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California dismisses Daniel Keith Wilson’s pro se complaint for failure to provide a short and plain statement of intelligible claims, while granting leave to amend. The court grants in forma pauperis status and recommends denial of the plaintiff’s motions for temporary restraining orders and related relief.

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               | December 19, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| DOCKET                | 2:25-cv-2984-DC-JDP (PS)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Pro se plaintiff filed an in forma pauperis civil-rights action. On mandatory screening, the magistrate judge dismissed the complaint with leave to amend and recommended denial of plaintiff's motions for temporary restraining orders and related relief. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | Mandatory screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); the complaint must satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) and allege facts sufficient to state a plausible claim for relief.                                                                      |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | Unknown; district court order and findings and recommendations, with no reported citation.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| PARTIES               | Daniel Keith Wilson v. M. De Arton, et al.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

TOPICS

- pleadings
- civil procedure
- injunctions
- motions to dismiss
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint satisfied the mandatory screening requirements and the short-and-plain pleading requirement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2).
2. Whether the complaint should be dismissed with leave to amend.
3. Whether plaintiff's motions for temporary restraining orders and related relief should be denied for failure to show a likelihood of success on the merits.
4. Whether plaintiff should be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

## HOLDINGS

1. The complaint did not satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) because it failed to provide a short and plain statement of intelligible claims showing that plaintiff was entitled to relief; it was therefore subject to dismissal on screening.
2. The complaint was dismissed with leave to amend, and any amended complaint had to be complete in itself, titled "First Amended Complaint," and filed within thirty days.
3. Plaintiff's motions for temporary restraining orders and related relief were recommended for denial because he had not shown a likelihood of success on the merits.
4. Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis was granted.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*"The complaint, which runs to nearly one-hundred and thirty pages, lacks any intelligible narrative throughline, and leaves the reader with no sense of what or even how many claims are at issue."* (1)

*"Nevertheless, I will give plaintiff one chance to amend."* (2)

*"Any amended complaint will entirely supersede the initial one and must be complete in itself."* (2)

*"A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest."* (9-15)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Wilson sued numerous state officials, agencies, and health-care providers, alleging constitutional violations, malicious prosecution, and violations of whistleblower-protection law. His complaint was nearly 130 pages long, identified an indeterminate number of defendants, and lacked an intelligible narrative or clear identification of the claims. It also contained materials and allegations the court characterized as fanciful, including a purported writ of quo warranto and allegations concerning undisclosed "eboli" in the water supply.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a nearly 130-page complaint against a large and indeterminate number of state officials, agencies, and health-care providers, along with an application to proceed in forma pauperis and several motions for temporary restraining orders and other relief. The magistrate judge granted in forma pauperis status, dismissed the complaint with leave to amend within thirty days, and recommended that the motions for temporary restraining orders and miscellaneous relief be denied. The findings and recommendations were submitted to the assigned district judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), subject to objections.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-679 (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)
- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Dumas v. Gommerman, 865 F.2d 1093, 1095 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Martinez v. Yist, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)