



1 case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including the objections, the Court finds that the  
2 findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Plaintiff's  
3 objections are an apparent attempt to plead additional facts to state a cognizable claim for relief.  
4 (Doc. 16.) These additional facts are not sufficient to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. To the  
5 extent Plaintiff's allegations suggest a challenge to ongoing criminal proceedings in state court,  
6 any such claim is barred under the doctrine of *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971). The  
7 *Younger* doctrine "prevents a federal court in most circumstances from directly interfering with  
8 ongoing criminal proceedings in state court." *Jones v. Buckman*, No. 2:18-cv-0054-EFB P, 2019  
9 WL 1227921, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2019). "Further, the *Younger* abstention doctrine bars  
10 requests for declaratory and monetary relief for constitutional injuries arising out of a plaintiff's  
11 ongoing state criminal prosecution." *Id.* (citing *Mann v. Jett*, 781 F.2d 1448, 1449 (9th Cir.  
12 1986)). Insofar as Plaintiff is seeking to challenge prior convictions in state court, a civil rights  
13 action is not the appropriate method for asserting such a challenge; rather, Plaintiff must seek  
14 relief in state court or by way of a petition for writ of habeas corpus. *See Wilkinson v. Dotson*,  
15 544 U.S. 74, 78 (2005). Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 16 1. The findings and recommendations issued on January 13, 2023 (Doc. 15) are  
17 **ADOPTED IN FULL.**
- 18 2. This action is **DISMISSED**, without prejudice, for failure to state a cognizable  
19 claim upon which relief may be granted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 20 3. The Clerk of the court is directed to close this case.

21  
22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: February 1, 2023

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE