

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**

CATHERINE MENDEZ, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. EDCV 22-00452 AB (RAO)

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION OF
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
JUDGE**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed Plaintiffs Catherine Mendez, Jamari Carter, and Chasity Doll’s (“Plaintiffs”) Second Amended Complaint, Dkt. No. 13, Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment, Dkt. Nos. 32-34, 54, Defendants County of Riverside, Bodnar, Herwerk, Monges, and Rodriguez’ (“Defendants”) Opposition, Dkt. No. 67, Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, Dkt. Nos. 42-49, Plaintiffs’ Opposition, Dkt. No. 63, Defendants’ Reply, Dkt. No. 64, the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), issued February 13, 2024, Dkt. No. 70, Plaintiffs’ Objections to the Report, Dkt. No. 72, and all of the other records and files herein. Further, the Court has made a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which objections have been made. The Court is not persuaded by Plaintiffs’ objections and hereby accepts and adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge.

1 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment
2 is denied, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is granted, and this action is
3 DISMISSED with prejudice.

4
5
6 DATED: March 26, 2024



7 ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28