

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Kevin Hagan v. Dr. Grace Woo, et al.

Hagan v. Woo · No. 1:25-cv-00116-JLT-EPG (PC) · Decided December 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging inadequate medical care and retaliation. The court dismissed the action with prejudice for failure to state a cognizable claim and directed the Clerk 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	December 31, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00116-JLT-EPG (PC)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations recommending dismissal of a pro se prisoner civil-rights action for failure to state a claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- prisoner civil rights
- federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations recommending dismissal for failure to state a claim should be adopted after de novo review.

2. Whether the action should be dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a cognizable claim upon which relief may be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. The findings and recommendations recommending dismissal were supported by the record and proper analysis and were adopted in full.
2. The action was dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a cognizable claim upon which relief may be granted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.” (at 2)

“This action is dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state a cognizable claim upon which relief may be granted” (at 2-3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Kevin Hagan, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, alleged that he was denied proper medical care while incarcerated and that the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation retaliated against him for prior lawsuits. After the court found that both his original complaint and first amended complaint failed to state cognizable claims, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging inadequate medical care and retaliation by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The court screened the original complaint, found no cognizable claim, and granted leave to amend. After screening the first amended complaint and again finding it failed to state a claim, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal. Plaintiff filed no objections, and 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

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

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 KEVIN HAGAN, No. 1:25-cv-00116-JLT-EPG (PC) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDING 13 v. THAT THIS

ACTION BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM 14 DR. GRACE WOO, et al.,
(Doc. 16) 15 Defendants. 16 17 Kevin Hagan is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this
civil rights action filed 18 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On January 28, 2025, Plaintiff filed an initial complaint alleging 19 that he was denied proper
medical care while incarcerated and that CDCR was retaliating against him for his prior lawsuits.
(Doc. 1.) On June 24, 2025, the Court screened Plaintiff's complaint, 20 found that the complaint
failed to state any cognizable claims, and gave Plaintiff leave to file an 21 amended complaint.

(Doc. 12.) On August 22, 2025, Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint 22 (Doc. 15.), which the
Court screened and found to fail to state a claim. (Doc. 16.) 23 On October 29, 2025, the assigned
magistrate judge issued Findings and 24 Recommendations recommending dismissing this action
for failure to state a claim. (Doc. 16.) 25 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on
Plaintiff and informed him that 26 objections were due in 30 days.

(Id. at 9.) Plaintiff was further is advised that failure to file 27 objections within the specified time
may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. (Id. (citing 28 1 Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834,
838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) No objections were filed and the 2 | time to do so has passed. 3 According
to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this Court has conducted a de 4 | novo review of
this case.

Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the findings 5 || and recommendations to
be supported by the record and proper analysis. 6 | Thus, the Court ORDERS: 7 1. The findings
and recommendations issued on October 29, 2025, are ADOPTED 8 IN FULL. (Doc. 16.) 9 2.
This action is dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state a cognizable claim 10 upon which
relief may be granted; and 11 3.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. 12 3 IT IS SO ORDERED. 14 Dated: _
December 31, 2025 Charis [Tourn TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
24 25 26 27 28