

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Christy Phillips v. State of California, et al.

No. 2:24-cv-3378 DJC CSK P (E.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-3378 DJC CSK P · Decided April 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations after no party filed objections. The court declined supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims, granted Plaintiff’s unopposed motion to remand, and remanded the case to the Sacramento County Superior Court.

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	April 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-3378 DJC CSK P
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brought a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After a magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations and no party objected, the district court adopted the findings and recommendations, declined supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims, granted plaintiff's unopposed motion to remand, and remanded the case to the Sacramento County Superior Court.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Findings of fact were presumed correct; the magistrate judge's conclusions of law were reviewed de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reported citation
PARTIES	Christy Phillips v. State of California, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- subject matter jurisdiction
- section 1983
- civil rights
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Civil rights

Federal jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations when no party filed objections.
2. Whether the district court should decline supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims.
3. Whether plaintiff's unopposed motion to remand should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full.
2. The district court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims.
3. The court granted plaintiff's unopposed motion to remand and remanded the action to the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Magistrate Judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo." (at 1)

"The court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law claims in this action"
(at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Christy Phillips, a state prisoner proceeding without counsel, filed a civil-rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The action also included state-law claims. After the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, neither party objected, and plaintiff moved without opposition to remand the case to state court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. The magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations on January 24, 2025; neither party filed objections. The district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full, declined supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims, and remanded the case to the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento.

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The case was remanded to the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, in *Christy Philips v. State of California*, No. 24-cv-018638. The Clerk was directed to mail a certified copy of the order of remand to the

Clerk of the Sacramento County Superior Court.

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)

OPINION

(PC) Phillips v. State of California

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 CHRISTY PHILLIPS, No. 2:24-cv-3378 DJC CSK P

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, a
state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action seeking 18 relief under 42 U.S.C. §
1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate 19 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 20 On January 24, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and
21 recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice 22 to all
parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed 23 within
fourteen days. Neither party filed objections to the findings and 24 recommendations. 25 The
Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United 26 States, 602 F.2d 207,
208 (9th Cir. 1979). The Magistrate Judge's conclusions of law 27 are reviewed de novo. See Britt
v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 28 (9th Cir. 1983). Having reviewed the
file, the Court finds the findings and 1 | recommendations to be supported by the record and by the
magistrate judge's 2 | analysis. 3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 4 1. The findings
and recommendations (ECF No. 9) are adopted in full; 5 2. The court declines to exercise
supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining 6 || state law claims in this action; 7 3. Plaintiff's
unopposed motion to remand (ECF No. 6) is granted, and the case 8 || is remanded to the Superior
Court of California, County of Sacramento, Christy Philips 9 | v. State of California, No. 24-cv-
018638; and 10 4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to mail a certified copy of the order of 11 |
remand to the Clerk of the Sacramento County Superior Court. 12 13 IT IS SO ORDERED. 14 |
Dated: _April 2, 2025 "Daniel CoD tto— Hon. Daniel It |. Cod

1s UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

16 17 18 | jphilzacva378.801 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28