

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Abdullah v. Santoro

No. 1:24-cv-0572 JLT CDB (PC) (E.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2025) · No. 1:24-cv-0572 JLT CDB (PC) · Decided August 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted findings and recommendations recommending dismissal of Jalaal Abdullah’s civil-rights action for failure to keep the Court informed of his current address and comply with a related Court order. The Court dismissed the action without prejudice 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	August 11, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-0572 JLT CDB (PC)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations recommending dismissal without prejudice as a terminating sanction for failure to maintain a current address and comply with a court order.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; limited precedential value.
PARTIES	Jalaal Abdullah v. Kelly Santoro, et al.

TOPICS

- sanctions
- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after conducting de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
2. Whether dismissal without prejudice was an appropriate terminating sanction for Plaintiff's failure to maintain a current address and comply with the Court's order.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full after conducting de novo review.
2. Dismissal without prejudice was appropriate as a terminating sanction where Plaintiff failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b) and the Court's order requiring him to keep the Court informed of his current address.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“failure to file any objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of certain rights on appeal.”
(at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jalaal Abdullah brought a civil-rights action based on alleged violations occurring while he was incarcerated at North Kern State Prison. The Court's screening order was returned as undeliverable after Plaintiff was released or transferred, and Plaintiff had not kept the Court informed of his current address or complied with an order requiring him to do so. Plaintiff did not object to the magistrate judge's recommendation that the action be dismissed without prejudice.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil-rights action concerning events during his incarceration at North Kern State Prison. After screening the complaint, the Court's order was returned as undeliverable. The magistrate judge found that Plaintiff violated Local Rule 183(b) and the Court's address-update order, recommended dismissal without prejudice, and served those findings and recommendations on Plaintiff. Plaintiff filed no objections, and the district court conducted de novo review, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, dismissed the action without prejudice, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)

