

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Gastelum v. Nihal, LLC

Gastelum · No. 2:23-cv-0577-KJM-JDP (PS) · Decided September 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations after no objections were filed. The court granted defendant’s motion for summary judgment on plaintiff’s ADA claims, declined supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims, dismissed those claims without prejudice, denied plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment, and closed the case.

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	September 2, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-0577-KJM-JDP (PS)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after no party filed objections. The court adopted the findings and recommendations, granted defendant's motion for summary judgment on plaintiff's ADA claims, declined supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims, dismissed those claims without prejudice, denied plaintiff's summary-judgment motion, and closed the case.
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
PARTIES	Fernando Gastelum v. Nihal, LLC

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- ada / disability
- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Disability discrimination

Supplemental jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted when no objections were filed.
2. Whether defendant was entitled to summary judgment on plaintiff's ADA claims.
3. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's state-law claims after resolving the federal ADA claims.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after reviewing the record and determining that they were supported by the record and proper analysis.
2. Defendant's motion for summary judgment was granted, and judgment was entered in defendant's favor on plaintiff's ADA claims.
3. The court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's state-law claims and dismissed those claims without prejudice to refiling in state court.
4. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion provides no substantive factual account of the parties' dispute. It states only that plaintiff asserted ADA claims and state-law claims, and that defendant and plaintiff each filed a motion for summary judgment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On July 17, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations and served them with notice that objections were due within fourteen days. No objections were filed. The district court presumed the findings of fact correct, reviewed legal conclusions *de novo*, adopted the findings and recommendations, and entered judgment for defendant on the ADA claims while dismissing the state-law claims without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

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

(PS) Gastelum v. Nihal, LLC

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 FERNANDO GASTELUM, Case No. 2:23-cv-0577-KJM-JDP (PS) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v.
ORDER

14 NIHAL, LLC,

15 Defendants. 16

17 On July 17, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were 18
served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and 19
recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. No objections were filed. 20 The court
presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 21 602 F.2d 207, 208
(9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de 22 novo. See *Robbins*
v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by 23 the magistrate judge
are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court 24”). Having
reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be 25 supported by the
record and by the proper analysis. 26 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 27 1. The
Findings and Recommendations filed July 17, 2025, are ADOPTED; 28 2. Defendant’s motion for
summary judgment, ECF No. 20, is GRANTED; 1 3. Judgment is entered in defendant’s favor on
plaintiff’s ADA claims; 2 4. The court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over
plaintiff’s state law 3 claims; 4 5. Plaintiff’s state law claims are dismissed without prejudice to
plaintiff bringing them, 5 if he wishes, in state court; 6 6. Plaintiff’s motion for summary
judgment, ECF No. 16, is DENIED; and 7 7. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case. 8
DATED: August 29, 2025. 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28