UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TREHANA CLEMMONS,

Plaintiff,

v.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF,

Defendant.

No. 2:25-cv-01368-DAD-CSK

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING THIS ACTION WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND, AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS AS HAVING BEEN RENDERED MOOT BY THIS ORDER

(Doc. Nos. 2, 3, 5)

Plaintiff Trehana Clemmons is proceeding *pro se* in this civil action which she initiated by filing her complaint in this court on May 14, 2025. (Doc. No. 1.) This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On August 25, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff's complaint be dismissed without leave to amend. (Doc. No. 5.) Specifically, the assigned magistrate judge found that the complaint failed to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, contained only vague and conclusory allegations, and failed to state a cognizable claim against defendant. (*Id.* at 5–6.) Regarding leave to amend, the magistrate judge noted that plaintiff asserts only violations of criminal statutes that do not provide a private right of civil action. (*Id.* at 6.) The pending findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 7–8.) To date, plaintiff has not filed any objections to the pending findings and recommendations and the time in which to do so has long since passed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

For the reasons above,

1. The findings and recommendations issued on August 25, 2025 (Doc. No. 5) are ADOPTED in full;
2. Plaintiff's complaint is DISMISSED without leave to amend;
3. Plaintiff's motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 2) and for injunctive relief (Doc. No. 3) are DENIED as having been rendered moot by this order; and
4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **March 20, 2026**

Dale A. Drozd

DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE