

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

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