

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Chad Adam Cheever v. Ryan Lagore

Cheever · No. 2:25-cv-01576-YY · Decided April 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon reviewed objections to a magistrate judge’s recommendation concerning Chad Adam Cheever’s motion for federal removal of a criminal prosecution. The court adopted the Findings and Recommendation, denied the motion, denied other pending motions as moot, and dismissed the action with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Baggio, District Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	April 22, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01576-YY
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner objected to a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation recommending denial of his motion for federal removal of a criminal prosecution and dismissal of the action with prejudice. The district court conducted de novo review and adopted the Findings and Recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation to which a party objects.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated in the opinion.
PARTIES	Chad Adam Cheever, Petitioner v. Ryan Lagore, Respondent

TOPICS

- habeas corpus
- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- federal habeas corpus
- federal civil procedure
- magistrate judge recommendations

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should modify the magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation after de novo review of Petitioner's objections.
2. Whether Petitioner's Motion for Federal Removal of Criminal Prosecution should be denied and the action dismissed with prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. When a party objects to any portion of a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must conduct a de novo determination of the objected-to portion.
2. The court found no basis to modify the Findings and Recommendation, denied Petitioner's motion, denied the other pending motions as moot, and dismissed the action with prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge’s report.” (at 1)

“Therefore, Petitioner’s Motion [1] is DENIED, all other pending motions are DENIED AS MOOT, and this action is DISMISSED with prejudice.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns Petitioner's Motion for Federal Removal of Criminal Prosecution. Petitioner objected to the magistrate judge's recommendation that the motion be denied and the action dismissed with prejudice, although the filed objections referred to a separate motion mailed by Petitioner. The district court reviewed the filings and record and found no basis to modify the recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge You issued Findings and Recommendation on January 21, 2026, recommending denial of Petitioner's Motion for Federal Removal of Criminal Prosecution and dismissal with prejudice. Petitioner filed objections, and the district court reviewed the objections and pertinent portions of the record de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). The court found no error, adopted the Findings and Recommendation, denied the motion, denied other pending motions as moot, and dismissed the action with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009)
- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc)

OPINION

Cheever

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

CHAD ADAM CHEEVER,

Case No. 2:25-cv-01576-YY Petitioner,

ORDER

v.

RYAN LAGORE,

Respondent. BAGGIO, District Judge: Magistrate Judge You issued a Findings and Recommendation on January 21, 2026, in which she recommends that this Court deny Petitioner's Motion for Federal Removal of Criminal Prosecution and dismiss this action with prejudice. F&R, ECF No. 18. The matter is now before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Petitioner filed timely objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation. Pet'r's Obj., ECF No. 23. The Court observes that the document filed as Petitioner's Objections, ECF No. 23, does not itself contain the objections. Rather, Petitioner states in ECF No. 23 that on January 25, 2026, Petitioner placed a "Motion for Objection" in the mail. ECF No. 23 at 3. The Court thus understands Petitioner to include ECF No. 22 as part of his objections. For completeness, the Court has reviewed all of Petitioner's filings following Judge You's entry of the F&R. When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Dawson v. Marshall*, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). The Court has carefully considered Petitioner's objections and concludes that there is no basis to modify the Findings and Recommendation. The Court has also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record de novo and finds no error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge You's Findings and Recommendation [18]. Therefore, Petitioner's Motion [1] is DENIED, all other pending motions are DENIED AS MOOT, and this action is DISMISSED with prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 22nd day of April, 2026.

United States District Judge

2 — ORDER