

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Seyed Saeid Zamanieh Shahri v. Los Rios Community College
District**

Zamanieh Shahri · No. 2:23-cv-1569-DJC-JDP (PS) · Decided June 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations in this action against Los Rios Community College District. The court dismissed all claims other than a specified retaliation claim as untimely, partially granted the defendant’s motion to strike, and referred the matter back to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial proceedings.

OPINION

(PS) Zamanieh Shahri v. Losrios Community College District
PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 SEYED SAEID ZAMANIEH SHAHRI, No. 2:23-cv-1569-DJC-JDP (PS)
12 Plaintiff, 13 v.

ORDER
14 LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DISTRICT,
15 Defendant. 16

17 This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 18 U.S.C. § 636(b)
(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On May 20, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed 19 findings and
recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which 20 contained notice that any
objections to the findings and recommendations were to be 21 filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff
filed objections on May 27, 2025, and they were 22 considered by the undersigned. 23 The Court
presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United 24 States, 602 F.2d 207, 208
(9th Cir. 1979). The Magistrate Judge’s conclusions of law 25 are reviewed de novo. See Robbins
v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) 26 (“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate
judge are reviewed de novo by both the 27 district court and [the appellate] court . . .”). Having
reviewed the file, the court finds 28 1 the findings and recommendations to be supported by the

record and by the proper 2 || analysis in large part. Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and 3 | recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis in large 4 | part. However, while the precise phrasing of the relief in the First Amended 5 | Complaint (ECF No. 42) at page 24 under the heading “6. Assurances and 6 | Preventative Measures” is inartful, the substance of the requests under them could 7 | theoretically form the basis of injunctive relief, and the Court will deny the motion to 8 | strike as to those requests for relief. 9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 10 1. The proposed Findings and Recommendations filed May 20, 2025 (ECF No. 11 | 55) are adopted; 12 2. Defendant's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 44) is GRANTED in part as follows: 13 a. all claims other than the retaliation claim set forth in charge 555-2020- 14 | 01236 are DISMISSED without leave to amend as untimely; and 15 b. the motion is denied in all other respects. 16 3. Defendant's motion to strike (ECF No. 45) is GRANTED in part as follows: 17 a. The “addendum” portion of the amended complaint (ECF No. 42), is 18 | stricken, as are the portions of the “statement of demands” that seek the termination 19 | of other employees and enforcement of state court orders; and 20 b. The motion is denied in all other respects. 21 4. This matter is referred back to the assigned Magistrate Judge for all further 22 | pretrial proceedings. 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 | Dated: _June 24, 2025
“Darl J □□ bratte— Hon. Daniel alabretta
26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
27 28