1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 SEAN WOFFORD, Case No. CV 15-1052-GW(SP) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 CHRISTOPHER BRACKS, et al., MOTION TO STRIKE ANSWERS 15 Defendants. 16 17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed: records on file; the 18 Motion to Strike the Answers of Defendants as Untimely and the related supporting 19 and opposing papers; the August 13, 2015 Order Denying Motion to Strike 20 Answers; and the objections and response thereto. The Court construes the Order 21 Denying Motion to Strike Answers as a report and recommendation, and the Court 22 has engaged in a de novo review of those portions of this recommended order to 23 which plaintiff has objected. The Court accepts the findings and recommendation 24 of the Magistrate Judge in the recommended Order Denying Motion to Strike 25 Answers. 26 // 27 28

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Motion to Strike the Answers of Defendants as Untimely and to Cause the Clerk to Enter Defendants' Defaults Nunc Pro Tunc (docket no. 25) is DENIED. Jeorge K. Win DATED: September 20, 2015 HONORABLE GEORGE H. WU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE