1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 ALICIA CASTANEDA-VALAZAQUEZ No. 2:15-cv-275-JAM-EFB PS GADDIS, 12 Plaintiff, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE 15 (INSURANCE) COMPANY, et al., 16 Defendants. 17 18 On November 2, 2015, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein 19 which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings 20 and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff filed objections on 21 November 16, 2015, and they were considered by the undersigned. 22 This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which 23 objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore 24 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). As 25 to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court 26 assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law. See Orand v. United 27 States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are 28 reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). 1

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 November 2, 2015, are adopted;
5	2. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 39, 42) is denied.
6	DATED: March 23, 2016
7	/s/ John A. Mendez_
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	