

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Dustin Lamont Crawford v. Fresno County Jail, et al.

Crawford · No. 1:25-cv-0869 JLT SAB · Decided September 12, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted in full the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations concerning Dustin Lamont Crawford’s civil rights complaint arising from his custody at Fresno County Jail. The court dismissed the second amended complaint without leave to amend and without prejudice for failure to state a cognizable civil-rights claim and for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, and directed the clerk to close 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 12, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-0869 JLT SAB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After screening Plaintiff’s second amended civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), a magistrate judge recommended dismissal without leave to amend and without prejudice. The district court conducted de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), adopted the findings and recommendations, dismissed the action, and directed the clerk to close the case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Dustin Lamont Crawford v. Fresno County Jail, et al.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- section 1983
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after conducting de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
2. Whether the second amended complaint should be dismissed because it failed to articulate a civil-rights violation or establish subject matter jurisdiction.
3. Whether dismissal should be without leave to amend and without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full after conducting de novo review.
2. The action had to be dismissed without prejudice because the court was unable to find that it had subject matter jurisdiction over the matter.
3. The second amended complaint was dismissed without leave to amend.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because the Court is unable to find it has jurisdiction over this matter, dismissal without prejudice is appropriate.” (at 2)

“Given the SAC fails to articulate even a short and plain statement of the claim against the unspecified number of Doe ‘CO/Sheriffs’ Defendants, the Court cannot independently discern any violation of a civil right from the face of the SAC.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Dustin Lamont Crawford alleged that his civil rights were violated while he was in custody at Fresno County Jail. His second amended complaint did not state what civil right had been violated and did not provide a short and plain statement of a claim against the unspecified Doe correctional-officer or sheriff defendants. The court noted that Plaintiff had already received two opportunities to cure deficiencies but had not supplied sufficient factual detail to state a plausible claim or establish subject matter jurisdiction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil-rights complaint concerning alleged violations while he was in custody at Fresno County Jail and later filed a second amended complaint. The magistrate judge found that the second amended complaint failed to identify the civil right allegedly violated, failed to provide a short and plain statement against the unspecified Doe defendants, and did not establish a basis for subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff did not object to the findings and recommendations within the prescribed period. The district court reviewed the matter de novo, adopted the recommendations in full, dismissed without leave to amend and without prejudice, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Kelly v. Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc., 377 F.3d 1034, 1036 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Missouri ex rel. Koster v. Harris, 847 F.3d 646, 656 (9th Cir. 2017)

OPINION

Crawford

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 DUSTIN LAMONT CRAWFORD,) Case No.: 1:25-cv-0869 JLT SAB) 12 Plaintiff,)

ORDER ADOPTING IN FULL THE FINDINGS

) AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING THE

13 v.) ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE, AND

) DIRECTING THE CLERK OF COURT TO CLOSE

14 FRESNO COUNTY JAIL, et al.,) THIS CASE

) 15 Defendants.) (Doc. 8)) 16 17 Dustin Lamont Crawford filed a civil rights complaint, suggesting that he suffered violations of 18 his civil rights while in custody at Fresno County Jail. (See Doc. 7.) The Court screened Plaintiff's 19 second amended complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a) and observed that Plaintiff failed "to 20 complete the portion of the form complaint that requests Plaintiff to state what civil right has been 21 violated." (Doc. 8 at 5.) The magistrate judge found, "Given the SAC fails to articulate even a short 22 and plain statement of the claim against the unspecified number of Doe 'CO/Sheriffs' Defendants, the 23 Court cannot independently discern any violation of a civil right from the face of the SAC." (Id.) 24 Consequently, the magistrate judge found that "it appears this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction." 25 (Id.) The magistrate judge also opined leave to amend was futile, because the Court granted Plaintiff 26 "[two] opportunities to cure the deficiencies identified in the Court's previous screening orders" and 27 Plaintiff "failed to provide sufficient factual details to state a claim ... that is plausible on its face or 28 establish that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction." (Id.) Therefore, the magistrate judge 1 recommended the Court dismiss the matter without leave to amend." (/d.) 2 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him that any 3 || objections were due within 14 days. (Doc. 8 at 7.) The Court advised him that the "failure to file 4 || objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal." (/d., citing 5 || Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did not file objections, and

the 6 || time to do so has passed. 7 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a de
novo review of this case. 8 || Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the
Findings and Recommendations are 9 || supported by the record and proper analysis. Because the
Court is unable to find it has jurisdiction 10 || over this matter, dismissal without prejudice is
appropriate. See *Kelly v. Fleetwood Enters., Inc.*, 377 11 || F.3d 1034, 1036 (9th Cir. 2004)
("because the district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction, the 12 || claims should have been
dismissed without prejudice"); *Missouri ex rel. Koster v. Harris*, 847 F.3d 13 || 646, 656 (9th Cir.
2017) (the proper dismissal for lack of jurisdiction "is without prejudice"). Thus, 14 || the Court
ORDERS: 15 1. The Findings and Recommendations dated August 15, 2025 (Doc. 8) are
ADOPTED 16 full. 17 2. The second amended complaint is DISMISSED without leave to amend.
18 3. The action is DISMISSED without prejudice. 19 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close
this case. 20 21 ☐☐ IS SO ORDERED. 22 |! Dated: _ September 12, 2025 (LAW pA LU. wan
23 TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24 25 26 27 28