

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Woosley v. Borla

No. 2:25-cv-0946-DJC-CSK P · No. No. 2:25-cv-0946-DJC-CSK P · Decided July 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations and dismissed Aaron Michael Woosley’s habeas corpus action under the Younger abstention doctrine. The court declined to issue a certificate of appealability and directed the Clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daniel J. Calabretta
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	July 9, 2025
DOCKET	No. 2:25-cv-0946-DJC-CSK P
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A state prisoner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. After the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending dismissal, petitioner filed a motion for reconsideration, which the district court construed as objections. The district court adopted the findings and recommendations, dismissed the action, closed the case, and declined to issue a certificate of appealability.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court presumed that factual findings were correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's conclusions of law de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Aaron Michael Woosley v. Edward Borla

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- constitutional law

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should treat petitioner's motion for reconsideration of unadopted findings and recommendations as objections.
2. Whether the subsequent completion of state court proceedings eliminated the need for Younger abstention when those proceedings were ongoing when the federal habeas action was filed.
3. Whether petitioner was entitled to a certificate of appealability.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion for reconsideration directed at unadopted magistrate judge findings and recommendations was properly considered as objections to those findings and recommendations.
2. When state court proceedings were ongoing when a federal action was filed, Younger abstention requires dismissal even if the state proceedings are completed later.
3. Petitioner was not entitled to a certificate of appealability because he had not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Where, as here, state court proceedings were ongoing at the time of filing, the district court is required by Younger abstention to dismiss the action, even if the state court proceedings are later completed.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner was a California state prisoner challenging his conviction through a federal habeas petition. His direct appeal concluded on May 23, 2024, when a California appellate court affirmed his conviction. The federal action had been filed while state court proceedings were ongoing, and petitioner argued that the later completion of those proceedings affected the application of Younger abstention.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

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 May 7, 2025, and petitioner objected. The district court treated petitioner's motion for reconsideration as objections because the recommendations had not yet been adopted, reviewed the findings and recommendations, adopted them in full, and dismissed the action.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983)
- Beltran v. State of California, 871 F.2d 777, 782 (9th Cir. 1988)

OPINION

(HC) Woosley v. Borla

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 AARON MICHAEL WOOSLEY, No. 2:25-cv-0946-DJC-CSK P

12 Petitioner, 13 v. ORDER

14 EDWARD BORLA,

15 Respondent. 16

17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed an application for a writ of 18 habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United 19 States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 20 On May 7, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed Findings and Recommendations 21 herein which were served on Petitioner and which contained notice to Petitioner that 22 any objections to the Findings and Recommendations were to be filed within fourteen 23 days. (ECF No. 14.) Petitioner filed a “Motion for Reconsideration” of the Magistrate 24 Judge’s unadopted Findings and Recommendations. (ECF No. 15) However, as the 25 Court has not yet adopted the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations, reconsideration 26 is inappropriate. Instead, the Court will consider Petitioner’s filing as objections to the 27 Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations. 28 The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United 1 | States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The Magistrate Judge’s conclusions of law 2 | are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 3 | (9th Cir. 1983). Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and 4 | recommendations to be supported by the record and by the Magistrate Judge’s 5 || analysis. 6 In Petitioner's objections, he notes that his direct appeal concluded on May 23, 7 || 2024, when the California appeals court affirmed his conviction. (ECF No. 15 at 3.) 8 | The subsequent termination of state court proceedings does not alter the Court's 9 | application of the Younger abstention doctrine. Whether the Court must abstain 10 | under Younger is determined by whether state Court proceedings were ongoing at 11 || the time the federal action is filed. See Beltran v. State of California, 871 F.2d 777, 782 12 | (9th Cir. 1988). Where, as here, state court proceedings were ongoing at the time of 13 | filing, the district court is required by Younger abstention to dismiss the action, even if 14 | the state court proceedings are later completed. See id. 15 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 16 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued

May 7, 2025 (ECF No. 14) are 17 | adopted in full; 18 2. This action is dismissed; 19 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case; and 20 3. The Court declines to issue the certificate of appealability referenced in 28 21 | U.S.C. § 2253 as Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a 22 | constitutional right, see 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 | Dated: _ July 8, 2025 “Daniel CoD batt Hon. Daniel Lt Cod

26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

27 28 1 /woos25v0946.800.hc 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26
27 28