

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

KRYSTAL JASMIN,	)	NO. CV 16-06999-FMO (JDE)
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS
SANTA MONICA POLICE	)	AND RECOMMENDATION OF
DEPARTMENT, et al.,	)	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
Defendants.	)	JUDGE

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and this Court’s referral order (Dkt. 109), the Court has reviewed the relevant filings in this action, including:

- a) Plaintiff Krystal Jasmin’s “Motion Per Circuit Rule 27 10. Motions for Reconsideration” (Dkt. 106) and a Motion to Set Aside Judgement and Order (Dkt. 107)—collectively, “Motions”;
- b) Defendants’ objections to the Motions (Dkt. 117);
- c) Plaintiff’s Requests to Change the Hearing Date for the Motions (Dkt. 112, 113), Plaintiff’s “Request for Stipulations per Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16” (Dkt. 114, “Request for Stipulations”), Plaintiff’s further motion for hearing on the Motions and the Request for Stipulations (Dkt. 115), Plaintiff’s request to film the hearings before the assigned magistrate

1 judge (Dkt. 118), Plaintiff's two requests to film and change the hearing  
2 date for the Motions before this Court (Dkt. 120, 121), Plaintiff's  
3 "Revised" Request for Stipulations and Request for Hearing (Dkt. 122),  
4 Plaintiff's two requests to file documents electronically (Dkt. 119, 126),  
5 and Plaintiff's additional request for hearing on the Motions and the  
6 Request for Stipulations (Dkt. 127)—collectively, Plaintiff's requests in  
7 this paragraph are referred to herein as "the Related Requests";

8 d) The Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge  
9 (Dkt. 125, "R&R");

10 e) Plaintiff's "Recusal Request and Objection to R&R dated May 9, 2019 as  
11 Vague and Ambiguous, and Unfairly Prejudicial" (Dkt. 128), a portion of  
12 which, reflecting Plaintiff's "recusal request," having been referred to and  
13 denied by the Hon. Stephen V. Wilson, United States District Judge (see  
14 Dkt. 130, 131); and

15 f) Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Objections to R&R (Dkt. 132).

16 The Court has engaged in a de novo review of those portions of the R&R  
17 to which objections have been made. The Court accepts the findings and  
18 recommendation of the magistrate judge.

19 THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 20 1. The Motions (Dkt. 106, 107) are DENIED;  
21 2. The Related Requests (Dkt. 112, 113, 114, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121,  
22 122, 126, 127) are DENIED.

23 Dated: September 11, 2019  
24

25 \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
26 FERNANDO M. OLGUIN  
27 United States District Judge  
28