

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

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