

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Roberto J. Edwards v. R. Singh, et al.

Edwards v. Singh · No. 2:24-cv-2480-TLN-JDP · Decided September 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopts the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in a prisoner civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court dismisses the action without prejudice and directs the Clerk of Court to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 10, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-2480-TLN-JDP
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in a prisoner civil-rights action after Plaintiff failed to file objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court presumed the magistrate judge's factual findings correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's legal conclusions de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- [civil rights](#) [prisoners rights](#) [section 1983](#) [civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

- [prisoner civil rights](#) [federal civil procedure](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations when Plaintiff filed no objections.
- Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice and the case closed.

HOLDINGS

- 1. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full after reviewing the file and determining that they were supported by the record and proper analysis.
- 2. The action was dismissed without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

- “Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.” (at 1)
- “The findings of fact are presumed correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979).” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Roberto J. Edwards, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil-rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The action was referred to a magistrate judge, who issued findings and recommendations. Plaintiff did not file objections, although the court determined that he had been properly served at his record address.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the matter was referred to a magistrate judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. The magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations on August 1, 2025. After reviewing the record and receiving no objections, the district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full, 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

Singh

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 ROBERTO J. EDWARDS, Case No. 2:24-cv-2480-TLN-JDP 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14
R. SINGH, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff Roberto J. Edwards (“Plaintiff”), a state prisoner
proceeding pro se, filed this 18 civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The

matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On August 1, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on Plaintiff, and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 20.) Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.¹ The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo.² Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the findings and recommendations was returned, Plaintiff was properly served. It is Plaintiff's responsibility to keep the Court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. ¹ See *Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court . . ."). ³ Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis. ⁵ Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: ⁶ 1. The findings and recommendations filed August 1, 2025 (ECF No. 20) are ADOPTED ⁷ in full; ⁸ 2. This action is DISMISSED without prejudice; and ⁹ 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case. ¹⁰ Date: September 9, 2025 ¹¹ ¹² ¹³ ¹⁴ ¹⁵ ¹⁶ ¹⁷ ¹⁸ ¹⁹ ²⁰ ²¹ ²² ²³ ²⁴ ²⁵ ²⁶ ²⁷ ²⁸