

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

OPINION

Berry

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 ARAM SARUKHANYAN,) Case No.: 1:24-cv-1091 JLT SAB) 12 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