

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Eswaran v. Newsom

Eswaran · No. 2:25-cv-1003-TLN-JDP (PS) · Decided August 11, 2025

OPINION

(PS) Eswaran v. Newsom

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 SURESH ESWARAN,

12 Plaintiff, Case No. 2:25-cv-1003-TLN-JDP (PS) 13 v. 14 GAVIN NEWSOM, et al., ORDER
15 Defendants. 16 17 On June 23, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations
18 which were 18 served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings
19 and 19 recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff Suresh Eswaran,
20 (“Plaintiff”) 20 filed timely objections on July 7, 2025, and they were considered by the
undersigned. 21 The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United*
States, 602 22 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are
reviewed de novo. 23 See *Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007)
24 (“[D]eterminations of law by the 24 magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district
court and [the appellate] court[.]”). 25 Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and
recommendations to be supported by 26 the record and by the proper analysis. 27 Accordingly, IT
IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 28 1. The proposed findings and recommendations filed June 23,
2025, (ECF No. 8), are 1 ADOPTED in full; 2 2. Plaintiff is allowed to proceed with the Second
Amended Complaint’s First Amendment 3 censorship claim against Defendant Fredrick Radcliffe
only; 4 3. Plaintiff’s remaining claims are DISMISSED without leave to amend; and 5 4. This
action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for all further pretrial matters. 6 7 8 9 10
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28