

**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

OPINION

Keya Morgan v. County of Los Angeles District Attorneys Office

PER CURIAM.

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