

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Paschall v. Johal

No. 1:24-cv-00154-JLT-SKO (E.D. Cal. June 3, 2025) · No. 1:24-cv-00154 JLT SKO · Decided June 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations concerning Lamar Paschall’s amended complaint. The court allowed Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims to proceed against several defendants, dismissed Amandeep Johal from the action, and dismissed the remaining claims.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 LAMAR PASCHALL, Case No.: 1:24-cv-00154 JLT SKO 12 Plaintiff,
ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING 13 v.
DEFENDANT ARMANDEEP JOHAL FROM THIS ACTION 14 AMANDEEP JOHAL, et al.,
(Doc. 16) 15 Defendants. 16 17 Lamar Paschall seeks to hold the defendants liable for violations
of his constitutional 18 rights while housed at Sierra Conservation Center.

(See Doc. 12.) The assigned magistrate judge 19 screened Plaintiff’s amended complaint pursuant
to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a) and found Plaintiff 20 stated a cognizable claim for Eighth Amendment
deliberate indifference to serious medical needs 21 against Defendants Fu, Smith, Sinclair, Jane
Doe, and John Doe. (Doc. 13 at 4-10.)

However, 22 the magistrate judge determined that Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim
against Defendant 23 Johal, the Chief Medical Officer at the institution. (Id. at 10.) In response to
the Screening 24 Order, Plaintiff indicated his willingness to proceed only on the cognizable
claims. (Doc. 14.) 25 Following receipt of the notice from Plaintiff, the magistrate judge reiterated
the findings 26 made in the Screening Order and recommended the action proceed only on the
cognizable claims.

27 (Doc. 16.) In addition, the magistrate judge recommended the Court dismiss Defendant Johal
as a defendant and dismiss the remaining claims in the complaint. (Id. at 2.) 1 The Court served
the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him that 2 | any objections were due
within 14 days. (Doc. 16 at 2.)

The Court advised him that the “failure 3 | to file any objections within the specified time may
result in the waiver of certain rights on 4 | appeal.” (/d. at 2-3, citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772

F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff 5 | did not file objections, and the time to do so has passed. 6 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court conducted a de novo review of this case.

7 | Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations to 8 || be supported by the record and proper analysis. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS: 9 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on May 13, 2025 (Doc. 16) are 10 ADOPTED in full. 11 2. This action PROCEEDS on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference to 12 serious medical needs claims against Defendants Fu, Smith, Sinclair, Jane Doe, and 13 John Doe.

14 3. Defendant Amandeep Johal is DISMISSED from this action. 15 4. Any remaining claims in Plaintiff's complaint are DISMISSED. 16 5. The Clerk of Court is directed to update the docket. 17 18 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 | Dated: _June 3, 2025 Charis [Tourn TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28