

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rayon Jones v. J. Quiring

Jones v. Quiring · No. 2:24-cv-1933-TLN-JDP (P) · Decided January 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted in full the magistrate judge’s December 4, 2025 findings and recommendations in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action brought by state prisoner Rayon Jones against J. Quiring. The court denied Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunctive relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 15, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-cv-1933-TLN-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, sought preliminary injunctive relief. After a magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, and no party filed objections, the district court adopted the findings and recommendations and denied the motion for preliminary injunctive relief.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Absent objections, factual findings are presumed correct, while the magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- injunctions
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- prisoner litigation
- federal civil procedure
- preliminary injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted when no party filed objections.
2. Whether Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. When reviewing the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations, factual findings are presumed correct and legal conclusions are reviewed de novo.
2. Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Rayon Jones is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in a civil rights action against J. Quiring under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Jones filed a motion for preliminary injunctive relief. The district court reviewed the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations and the case file, finding the recommendations supported by the record and the magistrate judge's analysis.

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 December 4, 2025, and the objection deadline passed without objections. The district court reviewed the record, presumed the factual findings correct, reviewed the legal conclusions de novo, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, and denied Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief.

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)