

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

Keya Morgan v. County of Los Angeles District Attorney's Office

Morgan · No. 2:23-cv-10474-MRA-MAR · Decided April 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California entered judgment in favor of the County of Los Angeles District Attorney's Office, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Jackie Lacey, and Jeffrey C. Stodel, Jr. after granting their motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). The judgment dismissed Keya Morgan's claims against those defendants with prejudice pursuant to Rules 54(b) and 58(a), while claims against Joan Celia Lee and Kirk Schenk remained pending.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 KEYA MORGAN, Case No. 2:23-cv-10474-MRA-MAR 12 Plaintiff,
JUDGMENT FOLLOWING ORDER 13 vs. GRANTING DEFENDANTS COUNTY OF LOS
ANGELES 14 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, DISTRICT
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, LOS ANGELES COUNTY 15 LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, JACKIE DEPARTMENT, JEFFREY C. STODEL, LACEY, AND
JEFFREY C. STODEL, 16 JR., an individual, LOS ANGELES CITY JR.'S MOTION TO
DISMISS POLICE DEPARTMENT, JACKIE 17 LACEY, an individual, GABRIEL F. MUNOZ,
an individual, JOAN CELIA 18 "JC" LEE, as an individual and as Successor in Interest to the
STAN LEE 19 TRUST, KIRK SCHENK, an individual, and DOES 1–100, 20 21 Defendants.

22 23 24 25 26 27 1 On March 6, 2025, the Court granted Defendants County of Los Angeles
District 2 Attorney's Office, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Jackie Lacey, and Jeffrey
3 C. Stodel, Jr.'s ("County Defendants") Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of 4 Civil
Procedure 12(b)(6) and entered an Order dismissing Plaintiff Key Morgan's First 5 Amended
Complaint against County Defendants with prejudice.

ECF 100. County 6 Defendants thereafter requested the entry of Judgment in their favor and
against 7 Plaintiff pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(d). ECF 114. Plaintiff's claims 8
against Defendants Joan Celia Lee and Kirk Schenk remain pending. See ECF 103. 9 Ordinarily,
the Court's ability to issue a judgment is constrained by the "one final 10 judgment" rule.

See *Romoland Sch. Dist. v. Inland Empire Energy Ctr., LLC*, 548 F.3d 11 738, 747 (9th Cir.
2008). However, when an action involves multiple parties or claims, 12 district courts have

discretion to “direct entry of a final judgment as to one or more, but 13 fewer than all, claims or parties only if the court expressly determines that there is no 14 just reason for delay.” Fed.

R. Civ. P. 54(b); see Noel v. Hall, 568 F.3d 743, 747 (9th 15 Cir. 2009). Accordingly, the Court makes the following findings: 16 1. The judgment at issue is a “final judgment.” Curtiss-Wright Corp. v. 17 General Elec. Co., 446 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1980). 18 2. There is no “just reason for delay.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); 19 AmerisourceBergen Corp. v. Dialysist W., Inc., 465 F.3d 946, 954 (9th Cir.

2006). 20 3. Because there is minimal “interrelationship of claims,” the Court finds that 21 the judgment at issue will not lead to “piecemeal appeals.” S.E.C. v. Platforms Wireless 22 Int’l Corp., 617 F.3d 1072, 1084 (9th Cir. 2010) (citation omitted). 23 4.

The equities, including “efficient judicial administration,” prejudice, and 24 delay, warrant a separate judgment. Id. 25 // 26 // 27 // 1 Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54(b) and 58(a), the Court hereby 2 // enters judgment in favor of the County Defendants and against Plaintiff. 3 4 IT IS SO ORDERED. 5 6 // Dated: April 18, 2025 oc Mae K. AC— 7 HO.

MONICA RAMIREZ ALMADANI United States District Court Judge 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28