

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.

OPINION

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