

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

Antoine L. Ardds v. V. Kieu, C. Lundgren, and J. Levin

No. 2:20-cv-0133-TLN-CSK, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (March 11, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California reviewed a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court overruled or rejected the objections, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, and granted defendants’ motion for summary judgment.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                         |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Troy L. Nunley                                                                                                                                              |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                         |
| DECIDED               | March 11, 2025                                                                                                                                              |
| DOCKET                | 2:20-cv-0133-TLN-CSK                                                                                                                                        |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                       |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations on the parties' summary judgment motion after the plaintiff filed objections. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | The court presumed the magistrate judge's factual findings correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's legal conclusions de novo.                           |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished district court order                                                                                                                            |

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- summary judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- federal civil procedure
- prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted after review of plaintiff's objections.
2. Whether defendants were entitled to summary judgment.

#### **HOLDINGS**

1. The findings and recommendations were supported by the record and proper legal analysis and were adopted in full.
2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment was granted.
3. The district court presumes factual findings correct and reviews legal conclusions de novo.

#### **KEY QUOTATIONS**

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

#### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

Antoine L. Ardds, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights action against V. Kieu, C. Lundgren, and J. Levin under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The opinion does not independently recount the underlying factual allegations; instead, it adopts the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after reviewing the complete record and plaintiff's objections.

#### **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brought a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, who issued findings and recommendations on January 16, 2025. After an extension, plaintiff objected. The district court reviewed the record and objections, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, and granted defendants' summary judgment motion.

#### **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)