

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Henry Adams v. Solano State Prison, et al.

Adams · No. 2:24-cv-2802-TLN-JDP (P) · Decided January 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopts the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations after Plaintiff Henry Adams failed to file objections. The court dismisses the § 1983 action without prejudice for failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders, and directs the Clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 15, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-cv-2802-TLN-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after the plaintiff failed to file objections, adopted them in full, and dismissed the action without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court presumed the magistrate judge's factual findings correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's legal conclusions de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Henry Adams v. Solano State Prison, et al.

TOPICS

- section 1983
- civil rights
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- civil procedure
- prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations when the plaintiff filed no objections.
2. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice for failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court presumed the magistrate judge's factual findings correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's conclusions of law de novo.
2. The action was dismissed without prejudice for failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders, and the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations were adopted in full.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court[.]” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Henry Adams, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brought a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Solano State Prison and other defendants. After the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, Adams did not file objections within fourteen days.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, a pro se state prisoner, filed a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, whose December 4, 2025 findings and recommendations recommended dismissal. Plaintiff did not object within the prescribed fourteen-day period. The district court reviewed the findings and recommendations, adopted them, dismissed the action without prejudice, and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Robbins v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007)

OPINION

Henry Adams v. Solano State Prison, et al.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 HENRY ADAMS,

12 Plaintiff, No. 2:24-cv-2802-TLN-JDP (P) 13 v. 14 SOLANO STATE PRISON, et al., ORDER
15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff Henry Adams (“Plaintiff”), a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has
18 filed this civil 18 rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a
19 United States 19 Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 20
21 On December 4, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations which 21 were
22 served on Plaintiff, and which contained notice to Plaintiff that any objections to the 22 findings
23 and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen (14) days. This deadline has 23 passed and
24 Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations. 24 The court presumes that
25 any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 25 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979).
26 The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 26 See *Robbins v. Carey*, 481
27 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the 27 magistrate judge are reviewed
28 de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court[.]”). 28 Having reviewed the file, the
court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by 1 | the record and by the proper
analysis. 2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 3 1. The findings and recommendations
4 filed December 4, 2025, (ECF No. 20), are 4 ADOPTED in full; 5 2. This action is DISMISSED
6 without prejudice for failure to state a claim, failure to 6 prosecute, and for failure to comply with
7 court orders for the reasons stated in the July 7 30, 2025 order (ECF No. 18); and 8 3. The Clerk of
9 Court is directed to CLOSE the case. 9 | Date: January 14, 2026 11 7,

12 TROY L. NUNLEY

13 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28