

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ramello Randle v. Moreno, et al.

Randle v. Moreno · No. 1:25-cv-00230-JLT-EPG (PC) · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a prisoner civil rights action. The court dismissed the action without prejudice because the plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies before filing suit, and directed the Clerk of Court to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00230-JLT-EPG (PC)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis brought a civil-rights action alleging deliberate indifference to poor prison conditions. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal without prejudice for failure to exhaust administrative remedies before filing suit. After the plaintiff failed to object, the district court conducted de novo review, adopted the findings and recommendations, dismissed the action without prejudice, and directed the clerk to close the case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- prisoner civil rights
- civil procedure
- administrative exhaustion

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies before filing the lawsuit.
2. Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted after de novo review where Plaintiff filed no objections.

HOLDINGS

1. The action must be dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies before filing the civil-rights lawsuit.
2. The district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full following de novo review.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ramello Randle, a state prisoner, alleged that Defendants' deliberate indifference caused poor prison conditions that resulted in health issues for him and his cellmate. The complaint was filed before Plaintiff had exhausted available administrative remedies. After being ordered to show cause regarding exhaustion, Plaintiff did not respond.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the complaint on February 21, 2025. The magistrate judge issued an order to show cause regarding exhaustion under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, but Plaintiff did not respond. The magistrate judge later recommended dismissal without prejudice, and Plaintiff did not file objections within the permitted period. The district court reviewed the matter de novo, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, dismissed the action without prejudice, and ordered the case closed.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

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

OPINION

Moreno

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 RAMELLO RANDLE, No. 1:25-cv-00230-JLT-EPG (PC)

12 Plaintiff, ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING

13 v. ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR
FAILURE TO EXHAUST

14 MORENO, et al., ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES BEFORE
FILING THE LAWSUIT, AND DIRECTING

15 Defendants. THE CLERK OF COURT TO CLOSE THE
CASE

16 (Doc. 12) 17 18 Plaintiff Ramello Randle is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma
pauperis in 19 this civil rights action. Plaintiff filed a complaint on February 21, 2025, and alleges
that 20 Defendants deliberate indifference resulted in poor prison conditions that caused him and
his 21 cellmate to have health issues. (Doc. 1). 22 On August 8, 2025, the magistrate judge issued
an order requiring Plaintiff to show cause 23 why this action should not be dismissed for failure to
exhaust administrative remedies prior to 24 filing suit in compliance with the Prison Litigation
Reform Act of 1995. (Doc. 11.) Plaintiff did 25 not file a response. On October 8, 2025, the
magistrate judge issued Findings and 26 Recommendations that this action be dismissed, without
prejudice, based on Plaintiff's failure to 27 exhaust. (Doc. 12.) The Court served the Findings and
Recommendations on Plaintiff and 28 notified him that any objections were due within 30 days.
(Id. at 5.) The Court also advised 1 | Plaintiff that "failure to file objections within the specified
time may result in the waiver of rights 2 | on appeal" Ud., quoting Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d
834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did 3 | not file objections, and the time to do so has passed. 4
According to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(c), this Court has conducted a de novo review of the 5 | case.
Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds that the Findings and 6 |
Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 7 1.
The Findings and Recommendations issued on October 8, 2025 (Doc. 12) are 8 ADOPTED in full.
9 2. This action is DISMISSED without prejudice. 10 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close
this case. 11 b IT IS SO ORDERED. 13 | Dated: _December 4, 2025 Cerin | Tower

TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28