

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Taylor v. Cameron

Taylor · No. 2:23-cv-2353-WBS-JDP (P) · Decided May 13, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations after plaintiff filed no objections. The court denied as moot plaintiff’s motions concerning the amended complaint, default, and a stay, and closed the action for failure to pay the filing fee as ordered.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	William B. Shubb
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	May 13, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-2353-WBS-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after plaintiff failed to file objections, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, denied pending motions as moot, and closed the action for failure to pay the filing fee.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court presumed the magistrate judge's factual findings correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's conclusions of law de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status is unknown and no reporter citation appears.
PARTIES	Shauntae Taylor v. N. Cameron, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- default
- section 1983
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- civil procedure
- prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations when plaintiff filed no objections.
2. What standard of review applies to the magistrate judge's factual findings and legal conclusions.
3. Whether the action should be closed for plaintiff's failure to pay the filing fee as ordered.
4. Whether plaintiff's motions concerning an amended complaint, default, and a stay should be denied as moot.

HOLDINGS

1. When reviewing the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations, the district court presumes factual findings correct and reviews legal conclusions de novo.
2. The action was properly closed because plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee as ordered by the court.
3. Plaintiff's motion to grant the amended complaint and request for default and plaintiff's motion to stay were denied as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Shauntae Taylor, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court had ordered plaintiff to pay the filing fee, but plaintiff failed to do so. Plaintiff also filed motions concerning an amended complaint, default, and a stay, which the court denied as moot after adopting the magistrate judge's recommendations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, who filed findings and recommendations on April 15, 2025. Plaintiff did not object within the prescribed fourteen-day period, and the district court adopted the findings and recommendations and closed the action because plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee as ordered.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Robbins v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 SHAUNTAE TAYLOR, Case No. 2:23-cv-2353-WBS-JDP (P) 12 Plaintiff,
13 v. ORDER 14 N. CAMERON, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding
pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief 18 under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 19 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)
(B) and Local Rule 302. 20 On April 15, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and
recommendations herein which 21 were served on plaintiff, and which contained notice to plaintiff
that any objections to the 22 findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days.

Plaintiff has not filed 23 objections to the findings and recommendations. 24 The court presumes
that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 25 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir.
1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 26 See *Robbins v. Carey*,
481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the 27 magistrate judge are
reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court....”).

28 Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by
1 | the record and by the proper analysis. 2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 3 1. The
findings and recommendations, filed April 15, 2025 are adopted in full; 4 2. Plaintiffs motion to
grant plaintiff's amended complaint and request for default, ECF 5 | No. 39, is DENIED as moot; 6
3.

Plaintiff's motion to stay, ECF No. 48, is DENIED as moot; and 7 4. This action is closed due to
plaintiff's failure to pay the filing fee as ordered by the 8 | court's January 16, 2025 order. 9 |
Dated: May 12, 2025 rb them. hd. bE—~ 10 WILLIAM B. SHUBB UNITED STATES DISTRICT
JUDGE 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28