

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Juan Carlos Calderon v. J. Campos

No. No. 2:23-cv-2049-WBS-CSK, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (April 7,
2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a prisoner civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court denied the defendant’s motion to dismiss, ordered an answer within thirty days, and denied the plaintiff’s motion construed as seeking injunctive relief.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 JUAN CARLOS CALDERON, No. 2:23-cv-2049-WBS-CSK P 12 Plaintiff,
13 v. ORDER 14 J. CAMPOS, 15 Defendant. 16 17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se,
filed this civil rights action seeking relief 18 under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 19 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (B) and Local Rule 302. 20 On March 03, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein 21 which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to 22 the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days.

Neither party filed 23 objections to the findings and recommendations. 24 The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 25 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 26 See *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

Having 27 reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record 28 and by the magistrate judge’s analysis. 1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 2 1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 65) are adopted in full; 3 2. Defendant’s motion to dismiss (ECF No. 57) is denied, and defendant is ordered to file 4 | an answer to the complaint within thirty days of the date of this order; and 5 3.

Plaintiff’s motion for documentational legal matters, etc. (ECF No 64), construed as a 6 | motion for injunctive relief, is denied. 7 || Dated: April 4, 2025 ed blew aK. (htt — 8 WILLIAM B.

SHUBB UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 9 10 11 12 13 |} /cald23cev2049.801 14 15 16 17
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28