

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Joseph Raouf v. Unknown

Raouf v. Unknown · No. 2:25-cv-1724 DJC CKD P · Decided October 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations after the plaintiff failed to file objections. The court dismissed the matter without prejudice and directed the Clerk of Court to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daniel J. Calabretta
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	October 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-1724 DJC CKD P
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after the plaintiff failed to file objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court presumed the magistrate judge's findings of fact correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's conclusions of law de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- section 1983
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations when the plaintiff filed no objections.
- What standard of review applies to the magistrate judge's factual findings and legal conclusions.

3. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court may presume the magistrate judge's factual findings correct and review the magistrate judge's legal conclusions de novo when the plaintiff files no objections.
2. The magistrate judge's findings and recommendations were properly adopted, and the action was dismissed without prejudice.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Joseph Raouf was a state prisoner proceeding pro se. The opinion does not describe the underlying factual allegations or claims. The court relied on the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations and the absence of objections from plaintiff.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brought this action in the Eastern District of California. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. The magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations on August 6, 2025; plaintiff filed no objections. The district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full, dismissed the matter without prejudice, and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 JOSEPH RAOUF, No. 2:25-cv-1724 DJC CKD P 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER
14 UNKNOWN, 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, is a state prisoner proceeding pro se.

The matter was referred to a 18 United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (B) and Local Rule 19 302. 20 On August 6, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations 21 herein which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to Plaintiff that any 22 objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen 23 days.

Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations. 24 The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United 25 States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979).

The Magistrate Judge's conclusions of law 26 are reviewed de novo. See *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 27 (9th Cir. 1983).

Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and 28 recommendations to be supported by the record and by the Magistrate Judge's 1 | analysis. 2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 3 1. The findings and recommendations filed August 6, 2025, are adopted in full; 4 2. This matter is dismissed without prejudice; and 5 3.

The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. 6 j IT IS SO ORDERED. 8 | Dated: _ October 2, 2025 "Dane J CoO □□□□ Hon. Daniel alabretta? UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28