

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Sayyedalhosseini v. Los Rios Community College District

Sayyedalhosseini · No. No. 2:23-cv-1571-DJC-JDP (PS) · Decided June 25, 2025

OPINION

(PS) Sayyedalhosseini v. Losrios Community College District

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 SONIA SAYYEDALHOSSEINI, No. 2:23-cv-1571-DJC-JDP (PS)

12 Plaintiff, 13 v.

ORDER

14 LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DISTRICT,

15 Defendant. 16

17 This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On May 20, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed 19 findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which 20 contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be 21 filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff filed objections on May 27, 2025, which were 22 considered by the undersigned. 23 The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The Magistrate Judge’s conclusions of law 25 are reviewed de novo. See *Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) 26 (“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the 27 district court and [the appellate] court . . .”). Having reviewed the file, the Court finds 28 1 the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper 2 | analysis in large part. However, while the precise phrasing of the relief in the First 3 | Amended Complaint (ECF No. 43) at page 24 under the heading “6. Assurances and 4 | Preventative Measures” is inartful, the substance of the requests under them could 5 | theoretically form the basis of injunctive relief, and the Court will deny the motion to 6 | strike as to those requests for relief. 7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 8 1. The proposed Findings and Recommendations filed May 20, 2025 (ECF No. 9 | 56), are adopted in part; 10 2. Defendant’s motion to dismiss (ECF No. 45) is GRANTED in part as follows: 11 a. all claims other than the retaliation claim set forth in charge 555-2020- 12 | 01235 are DISMISSED

without leave to amend as untimely; and 13 b. the motion is denied in all other respects. 14 3.
Defendant's motion to strike (ECF No. 46) is GRANTED in part as follows: 15 a. The
“addendum” portion of the amended complaint (ECF No. 43) is 16 | stricken, as are the portions of
the “statement of demands” that seek the termination 17 | of other employees and enforcement of
state court orders; and 18 b. The motion is denied in all other respects. 19 4. This matter is
referred back to the assigned Magistrate Judge for all further 20 | pretrial proceedings. 21 99 IT IS
SO ORDERED. 23 | Dated: _ June 24, 2025 Donel J CoD tto— Hon. Daniel alabretta
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25 26 27 28