

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jones v. Quiring

Jones · No. 2:24-cv-1933-TLN-JDP (P) · Decided July 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopts the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations after Plaintiff Rayon Jones filed no objections. The court dismisses Plaintiff’s claims against the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for failure to state a claim and refers the matter back to the magistrate judge for further pretrial proceedings.

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	July 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-1933-TLN-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations concerning a state prisoner's civil-rights action after the plaintiff failed to file objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court presumed the magistrate judge's findings of fact correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's conclusions of law de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court per curiam order with no reporter citation.

TOPICS

- section 1983
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil rights
- Federal civil procedure
- Prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted when the plaintiff filed no objections.

2. Whether the claims against the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation should be dismissed for failure to state a claim.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court presumed the magistrate judge's findings of fact correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's conclusions of law de novo.
2. The claims against the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation were dismissed for failure to state a claim.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo.” (at 1)

“Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Rayon Jones is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who brought a civil-rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The action named J. Quiring and other defendants, including the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The district court determined that Jones's claims against the CDCR failed to state a claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff Rayon Jones filed a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, who issued findings and recommendations on June 3, 2025, recommending disposition of the claims. Plaintiff did not object. The district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full, dismissed the claims against the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for failure to state a claim, and referred the matter back to the magistrate judge for further pretrial matters.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter was referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for all further pretrial matters.

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) Jones v. Quiring

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 RAYON JONES, Case No. 2:24-cv-1933-TLN-JDP (P) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 J.
QUIRING, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, Rayon Jones, a state prisoner proceeding pro se,
has filed this civil rights action 18 seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred
to a United States Magistrate 19 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.
20 On June 3, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations which were 21
served on Plaintiff, and which contained notice to Plaintiff that any objections to the findings and
22 recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the
23 findings and recommendations. 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 that: 3 1. The findings and recommendations filed June
3, 2025, (ECF No. 16), are adopted in full; 4 2. Plaintiff's claims against the CDCR are
DISMISSED for failure to state a claim; and 5 3. This matter is referred back to the assigned
magistrate judge for all further pretrial 6 matters. 7 Date: July 24, 2025 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28