

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Mongia v. City of Fresno

Mongia v. City of Fresno · No. 1:23-cv-01234 JLT EPG · Decided May 20, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted findings and recommendations and dismissed Isaac Mongia’s § 1983 action against the City of Fresno and other defendants without prejudice. The dismissal was based on Younger abstention and the plaintiff’s failure to comply with a court order and prosecute the action.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 ISAAC MONGIA, Case No. 1:23-cv-01234 JLT EPG 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, RECOMMENDING 13 v. THAT THIS
ACTION BE DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE BASED 14 CITY OF FRESNO, et al. ON
(1) THE YOUNGER ABSTENTION DOCTRINE AND (2) PLAINTIFF’S FAILURE 15
Defendants.

TO COMPLY WITH A COURT ORDER AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE. 16 (Docs. 19, 20).
17 18 Isaac Mongia proceeds pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed under 19
42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Docs. 3, 18.) The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge 20
pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 21 On April 4, 2024, the assigned
magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations 22 recommending that this action be
dismissed without prejudice based on the Younger Abstention 23 Doctrine and on Plaintiff’s
failure to comply with a court order and failure to prosecute.

(Doc. 24 20.) Specifically, the findings and recommendations found that Plaintiff failed to respond
to the 25 assigned magistrate judge’s previous order to show cause and that Plaintiff had not taken
any 26 actions in relation to this case since filing his Second Amended Complaint on January 14,
2025. 27 (Id. at 2.)

The Court served the findings and recommendations on Plaintiff and informed him that 28
objections were due within 30 days. (Id. at 5–6.) Plaintiff was also warned that failure to file 1 |
objections may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. (/d. at 6 (citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 2 |
772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) No objections were filed and the time to do so has passed.

3 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has conducted a de novo review of this 4 | case.
Having carefully reviewed the file, the Court concludes that the findings and 5 || recommendations
are supported by the record and proper analysis.

Accordingly, the Court 6 | ORDERS: 7 1. The Findings and Recommendations (Doc. 20) issued
on April 4, 2025, are ADOPTED 8 IN FULL. 9 2. This action is DISMISSED without prejudice
based on the Younger abstention doctrine as 10 well as Plaintiff's failure to comply with a court
order and failure to prosecute. 11 3.

The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. 12 3 IT IS SO ORDERED. 14 | Dated: _May 20,
2025 Cerin | Tower TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28