

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Estate of Vincent Frank Boscaino, Jr., et al. v. Adventist Health
Hanford, et al.

Estate of Boscaino · No. 1:24-cv-00689 JLT EPG · Decided December 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted in full the magistrate judge’s Findings and Recommendations concerning Plaintiffs’ claims arising from allegedly inadequate medical care that led to Vincent Frank Boscaino, Jr.’s death. The court denied Adventist Health Hanford’s motion to dismiss after conducting de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), with no objections having been filed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charis E. Tourn
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 31, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00689 JLT EPG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs brought federal and California state-law claims concerning alleged inadequate medical care. The magistrate judge recommended denying Adventist Health Hanford's motion to dismiss. After no objections were filed, the district court conducted de novo review, adopted the findings and recommendations, and denied the motion to dismiss.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order with limited precedential value.
PARTIES	Estate of Vincent Frank Boscaino, Jr., et al. v. Adventist Health Hanford, et al.

TOPICS

motions to dismiss
 civil procedure
 health law

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure
 health law
 torts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations recommending denial of Adventist Health Hanford's motion to dismiss should be adopted.
- Whether Adventist Health Hanford's motion to dismiss should be denied.

HOLDINGS

- The district court adopted the findings and recommendations dated December 9, 2025, in full after conducting de novo review.
- Adventist Health Hanford's motion to dismiss was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs alleged that various defendants failed to provide adequate medical care to Vincent Frank Boscaino, Jr. The alleged failure to provide adequate care ultimately led to Boscaino's death, according to the complaint.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 9, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending denial of Adventist Health Hanford's motion to dismiss. The parties did not object within the prescribed period, and the district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full after de novo review.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
 CALIFORNIA 10 11 ESTATE OF VINCENT FRANK) Case No.: 1:24-cv-00689 JLT EPG
 BOSCAINO, JR., et al.,) 12) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND Plaintiff,)
 RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL 13) v.) (Docs. 66, 108) 14) ADVENTIST HEALTH

HANFORD, et al.,) 15) Defendants.) 16) 17 Plaintiffs bring federal and California state law claims, alleging that various Defendants failed 18 to provide adequate medical care to Decedent Vincent Frank Boscaino, Jr., which ultimately led to his 19 death.

20 On December 9, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued Findings and Recommendations, 21 recommending that Defendant Adventist Health Hanford's motion to dismiss be denied. (Docs. 66, 22 108.) The Findings and Recommendations advised the parties that any objections were due within 14 23 days. (Id. at 9.)

The parties were further warned that "failure to file objections within the specified 24 time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal." (Id. (citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 839 25 (9th Cir. 2014).) No party has filed objections, and the time to do so has expired. 26 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a de novo review of this case.

27 Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations are 28 supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 1 1. The Findings and Recommendations dated December 9, 2025 (Doc. 108) are 2 ADOPTED in full. 3 2. Adventist Health Hanford's motion to dismiss (Doc. 66) is DENIED. 4 5 || IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _ December 31, 2025 Charis [Tourn 7 TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28