1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 MICHELLE AGUILERA & ELI No. 2:15-cv-2313-JAM-KJN PS AGUILERA, 12 Plaintiffs, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 DAVID ROSENBERG & UNIFUND 15 CCR, LLC, 16 Defendants. 17 18 On March 14, 2016, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations (ECF No. 19 27), which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the 20 findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen (14) days. On March 28, 2016, 21 plaintiffs filed objections to the findings and recommendations (ECF No. 30), which have been 22 considered by the court. 23 This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which an 24 objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore 25 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981); see also Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 26 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). As to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection 27 has been made, the court assumes its correctness and decides the matter on the applicable law. 28 See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's 1

1	conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d
2	452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).
3	The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,
4	concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the findings and recommendations in full. Accordingly,
5	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
6	1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 27) are ADOPTED.
7	2. Defendants' motion to dismiss (ECF No. 23) is GRANTED.
8	3. The first amended complaint is DISMISSED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND.
9	4. The Clerk of Court shall close this case.
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	DATED: March 31, 2016
12	/s/ John A. Mendez
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	