

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Q1, LLC AND WILLIE
JEFFERSON,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO,
et al.,

Defendants.

CIV. S-08-1564 JAM KJN PS

ORDER

On May 25, 2010, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. No objections were filed.

Although it appears from the file that plaintiff Willie Jefferson's copy of the findings and recommendations was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

Accordingly, the court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

1 The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,
2 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the Proposed Findings and Recommendations in full.

3 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

- 4 1. The Proposed Findings and Recommendations filed May 25, 2010, are ADOPTED;
- 5 2. This case is dismissed with prejudice; and
- 6 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case and vacate any pending dates.

7 DATED: June 17, 2010

8 /s/ John A. Mendez
U. S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26