

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; precedential status is unknown.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)