UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM JAMES GRADFORD, JR., Plaintiff, v. STANISLAUS COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY, Defendant.	No. 2:25-cv-01940 DAD AC ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND (Doc. Nos. 9, 11)

Plaintiff initiated this civil action by filing a complaint on July 11, 2025, and proceeds *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*. (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(c)(21).

On February 10, 2026, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint and determined it to be deficient because it failed to state a cognizable federal claim for relief and none of the defendants' alleged actions identified in the complaint constitute a deprivation of constitutional rights or otherwise suggest any viable federal claims. (Doc. No. 9 at 3–6.) In addition, the magistrate judge found that the granting of further leave to amend would be futile given the nature of the identified pleading defects. (*Id*. at 7.) Accordingly, the magistrate judge

/////

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

recommended that plaintiff's complaint be dismissed without leave to amend but without prejudice. (*Id.* at 6.)

The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within twenty–one (21) days of service. (*Id.*) Plaintiff has not filed any objections to the findings and recommendations and the time in which to do so has long since passed.[1]

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.

Accordingly:

1. The findings and recommendations issued February 10, 2026 (Doc. No. 9), are adopted in full;
2. Plaintiff's complaint (Doc. No. 1) is dismissed without leave to amend and without prejudice for failure to state a claim;
3. Plaintiff's second motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 11) is denied as moot in light of the prior order granting him *in forma pauperis* status (Doc. No. 9);
4. Plaintiff's unauthorized first amended complaint (Doc. No. 12) is stricken; and
5. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 21, 2026**

Dale A. Drozd

DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

[1] Although plaintiff did not file objections to the pending findings and recommendation, on March 12, 2026, he did file a first amended complaint. (Doc. No. 12.) The court has reviewed that unauthorized proposed first amended complaint and finds that it suffers from the same defects as noted by the magistrate judge in addressing plaintiff's original complaint. It will therefore be stricken.