UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | |
|---|---|
| ANDREA MCPHEE,<br>Plaintiff,<br>v.<br>CHRISTA SIEGENTHALER, et al.,<br>Defendants. | No. 2:25-cv-01544-DC-CSK (PS)<br><br>ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS<br><br>(Doc. Nos. 13, 26) |

Plaintiff Andrea McPhee, who is proceeding *pro se*, brings this civil action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 21, 2025, Plaintiff filed the operative first amended complaint against Defendants Christa Siegenthaler, Sidda Reddy Pedaballi, Sudhakar Reddy Vatti, Gretchen Higgins, and Jennifer King ("Defendants"). (Doc. No. 6.) On August 20, 2025, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's first amended complaint, or in the alternative, quash service of process pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(5) and 12(b)(6). (Doc. No. 13.) On August 29, 2025, Plaintiff filed an opposition to Defendants' motion. (Doc. No. 16.) On September 11, 2025,



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Defendants filed a reply in support of their motion.[1] (Doc. No. 17.)

On February 12, 2026, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending Defendants' motion to dismiss be granted with leave to amend. (Doc. No. 26.) The findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 8–9.) On February 27, 2026, Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 27.) The court reviewed Plaintiff's objections and finds they do not provide a basis upon which to reject the findings and recommendations.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations filed on February 12, 2026 (Doc. No. 26) are ADOPTED IN FULL;
2. Defendants' motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 13) is GRANTED with leave to amend;
3. Within thirty (30) days from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff may file a second amended complaint consistent with the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 26), or file a notice of voluntary dismissal; and
4. This case is referred back to the magistrate judge for further pretrial proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **April 30, 2026**

Dena Coggins
United States District Judge

[1] Plaintiff filed additional oppositions to Defendants' motion to dismiss and letters following the completion of briefing on Defendants' motion to dismiss. (Doc. Nos. 18, 21, 22, 23, 25.) The assigned magistrate judge declined to consider Plaintiff's subsequent filings in her review of the motion to dismiss and issuance of the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 26 at 5.)