

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Seyed Saeid Zamanieh Shahri v. Los Rios Community College
District, et al.

Zamanieh Shahri · No. 2:23-cv-1569-DJC-JDP (PS) · Decided February 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations after considering the plaintiff’s objections. The court granted the defendant’s motion to dismiss, dismissed Folsom Lake College, and referred the matter back to the magistrate judge for further pretrial proceedings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daniel J. Calabretta
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	February 24, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-1569-DJC-JDP (PS)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after plaintiff filed objections, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, granted a defendant's motion to dismiss, and dismissed Folsom Lake College.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court presumed the magistrate judge's findings of fact were correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's conclusions of law de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Seyed Saeid Zamanieh Shahri v. Los Rios Community College District, et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted after review of plaintiff's objections.
2. Whether defendant's motion to dismiss should be granted.
3. Whether Folsom Lake College should be dismissed from the action.

HOLDINGS

1. The findings and recommendations filed February 4, 2025, were supported by the record and proper legal analysis and were adopted in full.
2. Defendant's motion to dismiss was granted, and Folsom Lake College was dismissed from the action.

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

The opinion provides no substantive facts concerning the underlying civil-rights claims. It states only that plaintiff proceeded pro se and that the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations addressing defendant's motion to dismiss.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter was referred to a magistrate judge under Local Rule 302(c)(21). The magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations on February 4, 2025, recommending disposition of defendant's motion to dismiss. Plaintiff filed objections on February 14, 2025. The district court considered the objections, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, granted the motion to dismiss, dismissed Folsom Lake College, and referred the matter back to the magistrate judge for further pretrial matters.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

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

(PS) Zamanieh Shahri v. Losrios Community College District

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 SEYED SAEID ZAMANIEH SHAHRI, Case No. 2:23-cv-1569-DJC-JDP (PS)

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER

14 LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DISTRICT, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff proceeds in this action in pro per. The matter was referred to a United 18 States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21). 19 On February 4, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and 20 recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained 21 notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed 22 within fourteen days. Plaintiff filed objections on February 14, 2025, and they were 23 considered by the undersigned. 24 The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United 25 States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The Magistrate Judge's conclusions of law 26 are reviewed de novo. See *Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) 27 (“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the 28 1 | district court and [the appellate] court... .”). Having reviewed the file, the Court finds 2 | the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper 3 | analysis. 4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 5 1. The proposed Findings and Recommendations filed February 4, 2025, ECF

6 No. 39, are adopted in full;

7 2. Defendant's motion to dismiss, ECF No. 30, is GRANTED; 8 3. Defendant Folsom Lake College is DISMISSED; and 9 4. This matter is referred back to the assigned Magistrate Judge for all further 10 pretrial matters. 11 12 IT IS SO ORDERED. 13 | Dated: February 21, 2025 “Daal A CoO □□□□ Hon. Daniel alabretta

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28