

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

Raymond Montezello v. Pesce, et al.

Montezello v. Pesce · No. 2:21-cv-00906-DJC-EFB (PC) · Decided November 19, 2025

OPINION

Pesce

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 RAYMOND MONTEZELLO, No. 2:21-cv-00906-DJC-EFB (PC)

12 Plaintiff,

13 v. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

14 PESCE, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in
an action brought pursuant to 42 18 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter is ready to proceed to trial. Plaintiff
has filed a motion “to e-file a 19 shareholder’s derivative action.” ECF No. 71. Such an action is
“an extraordinary process where 20 courts permit a shareholder to step into the corporation’s
shoes and to seek in its right the 21 restitution he could not demand in his own.” *Quinn v. Anvil*
Corp., 620 F.3d 1005, 1012 (9th Cir. 22 2010) (internal quotation marks omitted). Plaintiff herein
proceeds against three correctional 23 officers. From the motion, it appears that the “corporation”
plaintiff seeks to represent is the 24 California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.
However, this entity is not a 25 corporation, but rather an agency of the state of California.
Accordingly, plaintiff’s attempt to 26 add a shareholder’s derivative action to the current litigation
is inapt and must be denied. 27 //// 28 //// 1 It is therefore RECOMMENDED that: 2 1. Plaintiff’s
October 24, 2025 motion (ECF No. 71) be DENIED; and 3 2. Plaintiff’s October 31, 2025 notice
of shareholder’s derivative action (ECF No. 4 72) be STRICKEN from the docket. 5 These
findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 6 || assigned to
the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days 7 || after being
served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written 8 || objections with
the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned 9 || “Objections to
Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Failure to file objections 10 || within the
specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. *Turner v. 11 || Duncan*, 158
F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); *Martinez v. Yist*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). 12 13 | Dated:
November 19, 2025 _Slittidl Hema

14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/raymond-montezello-v-pesce-et-al-ukr07dgi>