

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

John Fial v. Hon. Meagan A. Flynn, in her official capacity as Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court; Nancy Cozine, in her official capacity as State Court Administrator of Oregon; and Casey Coddington, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the Oregon State Police

Fial v. Flynn · No. 3:25-cv-01496-YY · Decided June 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon adopted a magistrate judge’s Findings and Recommendation in full after conducting de novo review of the plaintiff’s objections. The court granted defendants’ motion to dismiss and dismissed John Fial’s complaint without leave to amend because amendment would be futile.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karin J. Immergut
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	June 17, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-01496-YY
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed de novo the portions of a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation to which Plaintiff objected, adopted the Findings and Recommendation in full, granted Defendants' motion to dismiss, and dismissed the complaint without leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of the magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation to which specific objections were made; no de novo review was required for unobjected-to portions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive value only
PARTIES	John Fial v. Hon. Meagan A. Flynn, in her official capacity as Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court, Nancy Cozine, in her official

capacity as State Court Administrator of Oregon, Casey Coddington, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the Oregon State Police

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

motion to amend

civil procedure

pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review governs a district court's review of the portions of a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation to which a party objects?
2. Whether Defendants' motion to dismiss should be granted.
3. Whether Plaintiff should be permitted to amend the complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. When a party objects to specified portions of a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of those portions; review of unobjected-to portions is not required.
2. Defendants' motion to dismiss was granted, and Plaintiff's complaint was dismissed.
3. Leave to amend was denied because amendment would be futile and Plaintiff could not state a plausible basis for relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"If a party objects to a magistrate judge's F&R, 'the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.'" (at 1)

"This Court DISMISSES Plaintiff's Complaint, ECF 1, without leave to amend because 'no set of facts can be proved under the amendment to the pleadings that would constitute a valid and sufficient claim or defense.'" (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns Plaintiff John Fial's civil action against Oregon judicial and law-enforcement officials sued in their official capacities. The district court's order addresses the magistrate judge's recommendation on Defendants' motion to dismiss and concludes that the complaint could not be amended to state a valid claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge You issued Findings and Recommendation recommending that Defendants' motion to dismiss be granted. Plaintiff filed timely objections, Defendants responded, and District Judge Immergut conducted de

novo review of the objected-to portions before adopting the Findings and Recommendation and dismissing the action without leave to amend.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985)
- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam)
- Barahona v. Union Pac. R.R., 881 F.3d 1122, 1134 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., 656 F.3d 1034, 1043 (9th Cir. 2011)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON JOHN FIAL, Case No. 3:25-cv-01496-YY Plaintiff, ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION v. HON. MEAGAN A. FLYNN, in her official capacity as Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court; NANCY COZINE, in her official capacity as State Court Administrator of Oregon; and CASEY CODDING, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the Oregon State Police, Defendants.

IMMERGUT, District Judge. On May 8, 2026, Magistrate Judge You issued her Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”), ECF 37. The F&R recommends that this Court grant Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, ECF 17. Plaintiff timely filed objections to the F&R, ECF 40, and Defendants filed a response, ECF 41. This Court has reviewed de novo the portions of the F&R to which Plaintiff objected and ADOPTS Magistrate Judge You’s F&R in full.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), as amended, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s F&R, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* But the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed.

See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). Nevertheless, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge, sua sponte” whether de novo or under another standard. Thomas, 474 U.S. at 154. This Court liberally construes Plaintiff’s objections as he is proceeding pro se.

Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam). This Court has reviewed de novo the portions of Judge You's F&R to which Plaintiff objected. Judge You's F&R, ECF 37, is adopted in full. This Court GRANTS Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, ECF 17. This Court DISMISSES Plaintiff's Complaint, ECF 1, without leave to amend because "no set of facts can be proved under the amendment to the pleadings that would constitute a valid and sufficient claim or defense." Barahona v. Union Pac.

R.R., 881 F.3d 1122, 1134 (9th Cir. 2018) (citations omitted). Therefore, this Court concludes that "amend[ment] would be futile because [Plaintiff] cannot state a plausible basis for relief." Cervantes v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., 656 F.3d 1034, 1043 (9th Cir. 2011). IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 17th day of June, 2026. /s/ Karin J. Immergut Karin J. Immergut United States District Judge