1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JOHN F. WESTON,) Case No.: 1:20-cv-0326 JLT GSA (PC)
12	Plaintiff,)) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND) RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL, GRANTING
13	v	 THE MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS, AND DISMISSING THE ACTION
14 15	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION,) WITH PREJUDICE) (Docs. 23, 30)
16)) ORDER DIRECTING THE CLERK OF COURT TO
17	Defendant.) ENTER JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF
18) DEFENDANT AND TO CLOSE THE CASE
19	John F. Weston is a former state prisoner, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with this	
20	action pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12132 (1994). The	
21	matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and	
22	Local Rule 302.	
23	The CDCR filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings pursuant to Rule 12(c), arguing the	
24	case should be dismissed based upon a prior settlement agreement, and the claims asserted are barred	
25	under the doctrine of claim preclusion. (Doc. 23.) The assigned magistrate judge determined the	
26	settlement agreement executed by Plaintiff in Case No. 1:19-cv-0131 "encompasses the current case's	
27	ADA claim," and "Plaintiff waived his claims against defendant CDCR in the settlement agreement."	
28	(Doc. 30 at 19.) As a result, the magistrate judge found the CDCR was "entitled to judgment as a	

1	matter of law." (<i>Id.</i>) The magistrate judge recommended the motion be granted and the case be	
2	dismissed with prejudice on October 24, 2022. (Id. at 19-20)	
3	The Findings and Recommendations were served on all parties, who were granted 14 days	
4	from the date of service to file any written objections. (Doc. 30 at 20.) In addition, the parties were	
5	informed the "failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the	
6	District Court's order." (Id., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014);	
7	Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991).) To date, no objections have been filed and	
8	the deadline to do so has expired.	
9	According to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this Court conducted a <i>de novo</i>	
10	review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire matter, the Court concludes the Findings and	
11	Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS :	
12	1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on October 24, 2022 (Doc. 30) are	
13	ADOPTED in full.	
14	2. Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings (Doc 23) is GRANTED .	
15	3. This case is DISMISSED with prejudice .	
16	4. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment for Defendant and to close this case.	
17		
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
19 20	Dated: November 21, 2022	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	