

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive value only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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/christopher-perez-v-cpl-beck-et-al-gajiofu0>