

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Pelton v. Amador County, California

Pelton · No. No. 2:21-cv-1968-TLN-DMC-P · Decided March 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The court dismissed Gary Redman, granted Amador County’s motion for summary judgment, and directed the Clerk to enter judgment and close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	March 31, 2025
DOCKET	No. 2:21-cv-1968-TLN-DMC-P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after the objection period expired, adopted them in full, dismissed Gary Redman as a defendant, granted Amador County's motion for summary judgment, and directed entry of judgment and closure of the case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court presumed the magistrate judge's factual findings correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's legal conclusions de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter or neutral citation.

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- summary judgment
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations when no objections were filed.
2. Whether Amador County was entitled to summary judgment.
3. Whether Gary Redman should be dismissed as a defendant.

HOLDINGS

1. The court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full because they were supported by the record and proper analysis, and no objections had been filed.
2. Amador County's motion for summary judgment was granted.
3. Gary Redman was dismissed as a defendant in the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court.” (Order at 1; 481 F.3d at 1147)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Sean Michael Pelton was a pretrial detainee proceeding pro se and brought a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Amador County and Gary Redman. The district court's order does not recount the underlying events or the evidence addressed in the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations. The court found those findings and recommendations supported by the record and proper analysis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff Sean Michael Pelton, a pro se pretrial detainee, brought a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, who issued findings and recommendations on March 12, 2025. No party filed objections within the prescribed fourteen-day period, and the district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full, granted Amador County's motion for summary judgment, dismissed Gary Redman, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Robbins v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007)

OPINION

(PC) Pelton v. Amador County, CA

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 SEAN MICHAEL PELTON, No. 2:21-cv-1968-TLN-DMC-P

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER

14 AMADOR COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

15 Defendant. 16

17 Plaintiff Sean Michael Pelton (“Plaintiff”), a pre-trial detainee proceeding pro se, brings 18 this
civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States 19
Magistrate Judge pursuant to Eastern District of California local rules. 20 On March 12, 2025, the
magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations which were 21 served on the parties, and
which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings 22 and recommendations
were to be filed within fourteen (14) days. This deadline has passed, and 23 no objections have
been filed. 24 The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*,
602 25 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de
novo. 26 See *Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by
the 27 magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate]
court[.]”). 28 Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be
supported by 1 | the record and by the proper analysis. 2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:
3 1. The findings and recommendations filed March 12, 2025, (ECF No. 43), are 4 ADOPTED in
full; 5 2. Gary Redman is DISMISSED as a defendant in this action; 6 3. Defendant Amador
County’s motion for summary judgment, (ECF No. 31), is 7 GRANTED; 8 4. The Clerk of the
Court is directed to enter judgment and close this file. 9 | Date: March 31, 2025 10 11 7, 2 TROY
L. fe

13 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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