

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Barra v. Boudreaux

Barra · No. 1:24-cv-0966 JLT BAM · Decided March 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted in full the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations concerning Anthony Lawrence Barra’s amended civil-rights complaint. The court dismissed the action for failure to state a claim after Plaintiff failed to file objections and had not cured previously identified pleading deficiencies. The clerk was directed to close the case.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 ANTHONY LAWRENCE BARRA,) Case No.: 1:24-cv-0966 JLT BAM)
12 Plaintiff,) ORDER ADOPTING IN FULL THE FINDINGS) AND RECOMMENDATIONS,
DISMISSING THE 13 v.) ACTION FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM,) AND DIRECTING
THE CLERK OF COURT TO 14 BOUDREAUX, et al.,) CLOSE THE CASE) 15 Defendants.)
(Doc.

10)) 16 17 Anthony Lawrence Barra seeks to hold the defendants liable for violations of his civil
rights 18 while a pretrial detainee housed at the Bob Wiley Detention Facility in Visalia,
California. (See 19 generally Doc. 8.)

The magistrate judge screened Plaintiff’s amended complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 20 §
1915A(a) and found he failed to state a cognizable claim. (Doc. 10 at 3-6.) Because Plaintiff failed
21 to cure the pleading deficiencies after the Court provided the applicable legal standards, the
magistrate 22 judge found further leave to amend was not warranted. (Id. at 6.)

Therefore, the magistrate judge 23 recommended the Court dismiss the action. (Id.) 24 The Court
served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him that any 25 objections
were due within 14 days. (Doc. 10 at 6.)

The Court advised him that the “failure to file 26 objections within the specified time may result
in the waiver of the ‘right to challenge the magistrate’s 27 factual findings’ on appeal.” (Id. at 7,
quoting *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 28 2014).) Plaintiff did not file
objections, and the time to do so has passed. 1 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court
performed a de novo review of this case.

Havi 2 || carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations are supported 3 || by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 4 1. The Findings and Recommendations dated February 27, 2025 (Doc. 10) are 5 ADOPTED in full. 6 2.

The action is DISMISSED for failure to state a claim. 7 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. 8 9 IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: _March 30, 2025 Cerin | Tower 11 TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28