

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Dion Peralta Duran v. County of Riverside

Duran v. County of Riverside · No. 5:23-cv-00106-AB (JDE) · Decided July 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California accepted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation in a civil-rights action arising from medical care provided during pretrial detention. The court granted summary judgment to Riverside County on the medical-care claim because the undisputed facts did not establish a constitutional violation, while denying summary judgment in all other respects. The court also denied the plaintiff’s objections concerning extensions of time and his untimely opposition.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 11, 2025
DOCKET	5:23-cv-00106-AB (JDE)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation concerning defendants' motion for summary judgment and conducted de novo review of the portions to which plaintiff objected.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of portions of the report and recommendation to which objections were made; summary judgment was proper where the undisputed facts failed to show a constitutional violation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- civil rights
- fourteenth amendment

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- constitutional law
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge properly denied plaintiff's request for a sixth extension of time to oppose the motion for summary judgment.
2. Whether reconsideration of the denial of the sixth extension was warranted based on a material change in law, a manifest failure to consider material facts, or newly available facts.
3. Whether plaintiff demonstrated inadvertence or excusable neglect warranting permission to file an untimely opposition.
4. Whether summary judgment was proper on plaintiff's medical-care claim against the County because the undisputed facts failed to establish a constitutional violation.
5. Whether plaintiff's proposed motion for summary judgment in opposition was timely under the scheduling order.

HOLDINGS

1. The magistrate judge properly denied plaintiff's request for a sixth extension because plaintiff had already received five extensions, represented that the fifth was the last and final extension, had more than three months to prepare the opposition, and waited until the day before the deadline to seek another extension.
2. Reconsideration was properly denied because plaintiff did not show a material change in law, a manifest failure to consider previously presented material facts, or qualifying new facts.
3. Plaintiff was not entitled to file a late opposition based on inadvertence or excusable neglect because he failed to show good cause for the sixth extension and failed to establish the asserted basis for relief.
4. Summary judgment for the County was proper because the undisputed facts failed to show a constitutional violation.
5. To the extent plaintiff sought to file a motion for summary judgment in opposition, the motion was properly denied as untimely because it was filed more than three and a half months after the deadline in the operative scheduling order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Summary judgment on this claim was proper because the undisputed facts failed to show a constitutional violation.” (at 2)

“Because Plaintiff failed to show good cause for a sixth extension of time, he also failed to show inadvertence or excusable neglect as a basis to file an untimely opposition.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged civil-rights violations arising from his pretrial detention, including inadequate medical care. Upon booking, he received a medical screening, was regularly seen by medical staff, and was transferred promptly to a hospital after reporting symptoms of ulcerative colitis in August 2018. The record contained no evidence that he had submitted multiple ulcerative-colitis-related requests before August 2018 or alerted County personnel to that condition before then.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff objected to the magistrate judge's denial of a sixth extension of time to oppose summary judgment, denial of reconsideration, and recommendation to grant summary judgment to the County on one medical-care claim. The district court overruled the objections, accepted the report and recommendation, granted the County summary judgment in part, and denied the motion in all other respects. The court also denied as untimely any motion for summary judgment plaintiff sought to file in opposition.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Franchise Holding II, LLC v. Huntington Restaurants Group, Inc., 375 F.3d 922, 927 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Sprague v. Financial Credit Network, Inc., 2018 WL 4616688, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2018)