

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Scott R. Shipley v. Anise Adams, et al.

Shipley v. Adams · No. 2:24-cv-00032-TLN-EFB · Decided September 25, 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 denied Plaintiff Scott Shipley’s motion for default judgment, dismissed the First Amended Complaint without further leave to amend, administratively terminated pending motions, and closed the case.

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 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-00032-TLN-EFB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after no party filed objections. The court adopted the findings and recommendations, denied Plaintiff's motion for default judgment, dismissed the First Amended Complaint without further leave to amend, administratively terminated pending motions, and closed the case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court presumed the magistrate judge's factual findings correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's legal conclusions de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Scott R. Shipley v. Anise Adams, et al.

TOPICS

- default judgment
- section 1983
- civil rights
- civil procedure
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations when no party filed objections.
- 2. Whether Plaintiff's motion for default judgment should be denied.
- 3. Whether the First Amended Complaint should be dismissed without further leave to amend.

HOLDINGS

- 1. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full after reviewing the record and finding them supported by the record and the magistrate judge's analysis.
- 2. Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment was denied.
- 3. The First Amended Complaint was dismissed without further leave to amend.

KEY QUOTATIONS

- “The Court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge’s analysis.” (at 1)
- “Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint is dismissed without further leave to amend;” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Scott R. Shipley, proceeding without counsel, brought a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Anise Adams and other defendants. Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint and moved for default judgment. The magistrate judge recommended disposition of the motion and complaint, and no party objected to the recommendations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff proceeded without counsel in a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, who filed findings and recommendations on August 13, 2025. No objections were filed, and the district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

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)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 SCOTT R. SHIPLEY, No. 2:24-cv-00032-TLN-EFB 12 Plaintiff, 13 v.

ORDER 14 ANISE ADAMS, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff Scott Shipley (“Plaintiff”) proceeds without counsel in this civil rights action 18 seeking 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 August 13, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein 21 which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to 22 the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days.

No party has filed 23 objections to the findings and recommendations. 24 The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 25 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 26 *Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007).

The Court has reviewed the file and finds 27 the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge’s 28 analysis. 1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 2 1. The findings and recommendations filed August 13, 2025 (ECF No. 23) are adopted in 3 full; 4 2. Plaintiff’s Motion for Default Judgment (ECF No. 21) is DENIED; 5 3.

Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint is dismissed without further leave to amend; and 6 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to administratively terminate any pending motions and 7 close the case. 8 IT IS SO ORDERED. 9 Date: September 25, 2025 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28