

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Dauwalder v. Atherton

Dauwalder · No. 1:24-cv-0523 JLT SKO · Decided August 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations concerning Daniel Dauwalder's request for a preliminary injunction. The court denied injunctive relief because the motion concerned alleged mail tampering at a facility not involved in the underlying Eight Amendment claims.

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	August 4, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-0523 JLT SKO
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations concerning Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction. Plaintiff did not file objections within the permitted period.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- prisoner litigation
- civil procedure
- injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after Plaintiff failed to file objections.

2. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to preliminary injunctive relief concerning alleged mail tampering at a prison facility and by officials not implicated in the underlying action.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full after conducting de novo review and finding them supported by the record and proper analysis.
2. Plaintiff could not obtain the requested injunctive relief because the alleged mail tampering at the California Correctional Institute in Tehachapi did not concern the Eighth Amendment claims arising from the Substance Abuse Treatment Facility of Corcoran or the prison officials involved in those claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Findings and Recommendations issued July 9, 2025 (Doc. 27) are **ADOPTED** in full.” (at 2)

“Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. 20) is **DENIED**.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff's underlying civil-rights claims arise from alleged Eighth Amendment violations at the Substance Abuse Treatment Facility of Corcoran State Prison. His motion for a preliminary injunction instead alleged that officials were tampering with his mail at the California Correctional Institute in Tehachapi. The court found that the requested relief did not concern the claims or officials involved in the pending action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Daniel Dauwalder filed a civil-rights action concerning alleged violations while housed at the Substance Abuse Treatment Facility of Corcoran State Prison. He later sought a preliminary injunction based on alleged mail tampering at the California Correctional Institute in Tehachapi. The magistrate judge recommended denial because the requested relief concerned conduct and officials outside the claims pleaded in this action. After Plaintiff failed to object, the district court conducted de novo review, adopted the findings and recommendations, and denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)

OPINION

(PC) Dauwalder v. Atherton

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 DANIEL DAUWALDER, Case No.: 1:24-cv-0523 JLT SKO 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
ADOPTING FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING

13 v. PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF

14 J. ATHERTON, et al., (Docs. 20, 27) 15 Defendants. 16 17 Daniel Dauwalder seeks to hold the
defendants liable for civil rights violations while 18 housed at the Substance Abuse Treatment
Facility of Corcoran State Prison. (See generally Doc. 19 1; see also Doc. 11.) Plaintiff filed a
motion for a preliminary injunction, asserting that the prison 20 officials are tampering with his
mail at the California Correctional Institute in Tehachapi. (Doc. 21 20.) The magistrate judge
found Plaintiff cannot obtain the relief requested, because the action 22 proceeds on his claims
under the Eight Amendment related to violations at SATF- Corcoran and 23 does not involve
claims related to mail tampering or any prison officials at CCI-Tehachapi. (Doc. 24 27 at 3-4.)
Therefore, the magistrate judge recommended the Court deny the motion for 25 injunctive relief.
(Id. at 4.) 26 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him
that 27 any objections were due within 14 days. (Doc. 27 at 4.) The Court advised him that the
“failure to file any objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of certain rights
on 1 | appeal.” (Ud., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff
did 2 | not file objections, and the time to do so has passed. 3 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1),
this Court performed a de novo review of this case. 4 | Having carefully reviewed the matter, the
Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations to 5 | be supported by the record and proper
analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 6 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued July 9, 2025
(Doc. 27) are 7 ADOPTED in full. 8 2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. 20) is
DENIED. 9 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: _ August 3, 2025 Cerin | Tower

TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28