

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Sarukhanyan v. Berry, et al.

Sarukhanyan · No. 1:24-cv-1091 · Decided September 12, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in full. The court dismissed Aram Sarukhanyan’s action with prejudice for failure to state a claim concerning deliberate indifference to a serious medical need and directed the clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jennifer L. Thurston
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 12, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-1091
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations following screening of Plaintiff's amended prisoner civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Plaintiff did not file a further amended complaint, respond to the order to show cause, or object to the findings and recommendations.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; precedential status is unknown in the source metadata.
PARTIES	Aram Sarukhanyan v. Dorothea Berry, et al.

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- prisoner civil rights
- federal civil procedure
- deliberate indifference to serious medical needs

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 1. Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted after de novo review.
- 2. Whether Plaintiff's amended complaint stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need.
- 3. Whether the action should be dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim.

HOLDINGS

- 1. The findings and recommendations were supported by the record and proper analysis and were adopted in full.
- 2. Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need.
- 3. The action was dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim, and the clerk was directed to close the case.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The action is DISMISSED with prejudice for failure to state a claim.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that Defendants were deliberately indifferent to a serious medical need while he was housed at the California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility. The magistrate judge determined during statutory screening that the amended complaint failed to state a cognizable claim. Plaintiff did not file another amended complaint or respond to the order to show cause.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge screened the amended complaint and found that Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable deliberate-indifference claim concerning a serious medical need. After Plaintiff failed to amend or respond to an order to show cause, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal. The district court conducted de novo review, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, dismissed the action with prejudice, and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Wilkers v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)

OPINION

Plaintiff,) ORDER ADOPTING IN FULL THE FINDINGS) AND RECOMMENDATIONS,
DISMISSING THE 13 v.) ACTION FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM,) AND DIRECTING
THE CLERK OF COURT TO 14 DOROTHEA BERRY, et al.,) CLOSE THIS CASE) 15
Defendants.) (Doc.

20)) 16 17 Aram Sarukhanyan seeks to hold the defendants liable for deliberate indifference to a
serious 18 medical need while he was housed at the California Substance Abuse Treatment
Facility. (See 19 generally Doc. 15.)

The magistrate judge screened Plaintiff's amended complaint pursuant to 28 20 U.S.C. § 1915A(a)
and found Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim. (Doc. 18 at 8-12.) Although 21 the Court
granted Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint, he did not, nor did he otherwise 22 respond
to the Court. (See id. at 13.)

Therefore, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause "why the 23 action should not be dismissed
for failure to state a cognizable claim, failure to prosecute, and failure 24 to comply with a court
order." (Doc. 19 at 1.) 25 After Plaintiff failed to respond to the order to show cause, the
magistrate judge issued 26 Findings and Recommendations, reiterating the findings of the
screening order that Plaintiff failed to 27 state a claim for deliberate indifference to a serious
medical need.

(Doc. 20 at 8-12.) The magistrate 28 judge recommended the Court dismiss the action "for failure
to state a cognizable claim for relief." 1 || Ud. at 13.) 2 The Court served the Findings and
Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him that any 3 || objections were due within 14 days.
(Doc. 20 at 13.)

The Court advised him that the "failure to file 4 || objections within the specified time may result
in the waiver of rights on appeal." (/d., citing Wilkers 5 || v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th
Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did not file objections, and the time to dc 6 || so has passed. 7 According to 28
U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a de novo review of this case.

Havi 8 || carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations
are supported 9 || by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 10 1. The Findings
and Recommendations dated August 22, 2025 (Doc. 20) are ADOPTED 11 in full. 12 2.

The action is DISMISSED with prejudice for failure to state a claim. 13 3. The Clerk of Court is
directed to close this case. 14 15 ☐☐ IS SO ORDERED. 16 || Dated: _ September 12, 2025 (LAW
pA LU. wan 17 TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28