

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

**Brent Lee Harding v. Correctional Health Services, et al.**

Harding · No. 2:21-cv-00922 KJM SCR P · Decided September 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action brought by a pretrial detainee. The court granted summary judgment to defendants Holt and Mencias, directed entry of judgment in defendants’ favor, and ordered the case closed.

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 10, 2025                                                                                                                                                 |
| DOCKET             | 2:21-cv-00922 KJM SCR P                                                                                                                                            |
| DISPOSITION        | other                                                                                                                                                              |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE | The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations concerning defendants' motions for summary judgment after no party filed objections. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW | The district 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| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE | Unpublished district-court order; precedential status is unknown.                                                                                                  |
| PARTIES            | Brent Lee Harding v. Correctional Health Services, Holt, Mencias, et al.                                                                                           |

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights litigation
- prisoner civil rights
- federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations when no party filed objections.
2. Whether defendants Holt and Mencias were entitled to summary judgment.

## HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full after independently applying the applicable review standards and noting that no objections had been filed.
2. Defendants Holt and Mencias were entitled to summary judgment, and judgment was entered in defendants' favor.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979).”* (Order at 1)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff was a pretrial detainee during the events underlying his federal claims. He filed a pro se civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 seeking relief against Correctional Health Services and related defendants. The order does not provide further factual details because it adopts the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff brought a pro se civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the matter was referred to a magistrate judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. The magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations on August 13, 2025, recommending disposition of the motions for summary judgment. Because no objections were filed, the district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full, granted Holt's and Mencias' motions for summary judgment, directed entry of judgment for defendants, and closed the case.

## 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

Brent Lee Harding v. Correctional Health Services, et al.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 BRENT LEE HARDING, No. 2:21-cv-00922 KJM SCR P

12 Plaintiff, ORDER 13 v.

14 CORRECTIONAL HEALTH SERVICES,

et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 Plaintiff, a pretrial detainee during the events underlying his federal  
claims, filed this civil 19 rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He is proceeding pro  
se. The matter was 20 referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)  
(1)(B) and Local Rule 21 302. 22 On August 13, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and  
recommendations, which 23 were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties  
that any objections to the 24 findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days.  
ECF No. 60. Neither party 25 has filed objections to the findings and recommendations. 26 The  
court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 27 602 F.2d 207,  
208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed 28 de novo. See  
*Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law 1 by the  
magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court 2 . . .”).  
Having carefully reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations are 3  
thorough and insightful, and supported by the record and by the proper analysis. 4 1. The findings  
and recommendations (ECF No. 60) are adopted in full; 5 2. Defendant Holt's motion for  
summary judgment (ECF No. 50) is granted; and 6 3. Defendant Mencias' motion for summary  
judgment (ECF No. 51) is granted. 7 4. The clerk of the court is directed to grant judgment in  
defendants' favor and close the 8 case. 9 This order resolves ECF Nos. 50, 51, 60. 10 IT IS SO  
ORDERED. 11 DATED: September 9, 2025. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28