

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Christopher Perez v. Cpl. Beck, et al.

Perez v. Beck · No. 1:25-cv-0162 JLT HBK · Decided September 12, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California construed Christopher Perez’s objections to findings and recommendations as a motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment. The court denied reconsideration because Perez identified no newly discovered evidence, clear error, or intervening change in controlling law, and ordered that the action remain closed.

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	September 12, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-0162 JLT HBK
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After dismissing the action for failure to state a cognizable federal claim, the district court construed Plaintiff's late-filed objections to the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations as a motion to alter or amend the judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A Rule 59(e) motion may be granted for newly discovered evidence, clear error, or an intervening change in controlling law; reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy committed to the district court's sound discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive value only

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- pleadings
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Civil rights
- Prisoner litigation
- Federal remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's late-filed objections should be construed as a motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).
2. Whether Plaintiff established grounds for altering or amending the judgment based on newly discovered evidence, clear error, or an intervening change in controlling law.

HOLDINGS

1. The court construed Plaintiff's post-judgment objections as a motion to alter or amend the judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).
2. Reconsideration was denied because Plaintiff identified no newly discovered evidence, clear error, or intervening change in controlling law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Reconsideration is an “extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources.”” (at 1)

“Plaintiff fails to identify any newly discovered evidence, show the Court committed a clear error in evaluating the allegations in his SAC or argue an intervening change in controlling law necessitates an amendment of the Court’s order.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Christopher Perez sued Cpl. Beck and other defendants based on alleged civil-rights violations at the Madera County Jail. The magistrate judge found that Perez's second amended complaint did not state a cognizable claim under federal law and that further leave to amend would be futile because prior legal standards had been provided and the pleading deficiencies remained uncured. The complaint also alleged negligence under state law, but the court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over those claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge screened Plaintiff's second amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), found that it failed to state a cognizable federal claim, and concluded that further amendment would be futile. The magistrate judge recommended declining supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state-law negligence claims. After the objection deadline expired, the district court conducted de novo review, adopted the findings and recommendations, and dismissed the action on September 4, 2025. The court then denied Plaintiff's objections construed as a Rule 59(e) motion.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Wood v. Ryan, 759 F.3d 1117, 1121 (9th Cir. 2014)

- Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Navajo Nation v. Norris, 331 F.3d 1041, 1046 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 883 (9th Cir. 2000)

OPINION

Beck

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 CHRISTOPHER PEREZ,) Case No.: 1:25-cv-0162 JLT HBK) 12 Plaintiff,) ORDER
CONSTRUING PLAINTIFF’S

) OBJECTIONS AS A MOTION FOR

13 v.) RECONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 59 AND

) DENYING RECONSIDERATION

14 CPL. BECK, et al.,)) (Doc. 20) 15 Defendants.)) 16 17 Christopher Perez seeks to hold the
defendants liable for violations of his civil rights at Madera 18 County Jail. (See generally Doc.
17.) The magistrate judge screened Plaintiff’s second amended 19 complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
§ 1915A(a) and found he failed to state a cognizable claim under 20 federal law. (Id. at 4-10.) The
magistrate judge found that further leave to amend would be futile 21 because the Court
previously provided the applicable legal standards and Plaintiff failed to cure the 22 pleading
deficiencies. (Id. at 11.) The magistrate judge observed that Plaintiff also “stated claims of 23
negligence throughout his complaint” and recommended the Court decline to exercise
supplemental 24 jurisdiction over the claims under state law. (Id.) After the deadline for filing
objections expired, the 25 Court performed a de novo review, adopted the Findings and
Recommendations in full, and dismissed 26 the action on September 4, 2025. (Docs. 18, 19.) 27
Following the entry of judgment, the Court received Plaintiff’s objections to the Findings and 28
Recommendations, which were dated after the deadline to for Plaintiff to submit the filing to
prison 1 || for reconsideration under Rule 59 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

2 Rule 59(e) permits a party to move a court to alter or amend its judgment. “A district court ms
3 || grant a Rule 59(e) motion if it is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear
error, 0 4 there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” Wood v. Ryan, 759 F.3d 1117,
1121 (9th Cir 5 2014) (internal quotation marks, citation omitted) (emphasis in original).
Reconsideration is an 6 || “extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality
and conservation of judicial 7 || resources.” Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877,
890 (9th Cir. 2000). Ultimately, 8 || whether to grant or deny a motion for reconsideration is in the
“sound discretion” of the district 9 court. Navajo Nation v. Norris, 331 F.3d 1041, 1046 (9th Cir.
2003) (citing Kona, 229 F.3d at 883). 10 Plaintiff does not identify allegations in the SAC that

support a conclusion that he states a 11 || cognizable claim. Plaintiff does not identify new facts for the Court to consider, which would support 12 || conclusion that he could cure the deficiencies identified related to his claims under federal law. 13 || Finally, Plaintiff does not dispute the determination that the Court should not exercise jurisdiction over: 14 || the claims for negligence arising under state law. Ultimately, Plaintiff fails to identify any newly 15 || discovered evidence, show the Court committed a clear error in evaluating the allegations in his SAC 16 || or argue an intervening change in controlling law necessitates an amendment of the Court's order. 17 || Consequently, Plaintiff fails to show reconsideration is warranted. See Wood, 759 F.3d at 1121. 18 Based upon the foregoing, the Court ORDERS: Plaintiff's objections, construed as motion 19 || under Rule 59(e) to alter or amend judgment (Doc. 20) is DENIED. The action shall remain closed. 20 21 ☐☐ IS SO ORDERED. 22 |! Dated: _ September 12, 2025 (LAW pA L. wan
23 TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24 25 26 27 28