

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**

ALFRED MCZEAL, JR.,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY OF TUSTIN, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 8:24-cv-00088-RGK-PD
**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT
AND ADOPTING FINDINGS,
CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS OF
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
JUDGE**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the First Amended Complaint, the motions to dismiss the First Amended Complaint filed by Defendants Woodruff & Smart, APC, Jason M. McEwen, and Nicolas A. Hutchens (collectively, the “Woodruff Defendants”) and Defendants City of Tustin and Brad Steen (collectively, the “City of Tustin Defendants”), the records on file, the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (“Report”), Plaintiff’s Objections to the Report, and the Woodruff Defendants and the City of Tustin Defendants’ response to Plaintiff’s Objections. [Dkt. Nos. 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 40, 47, 48, 50, 51.]


1 The Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the portions of the Report
2 to which Objections were directed. The Court accepts the findings and
3 recommendations of the Magistrate Judge and adopts them as its own
4 findings and conclusions.

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED as follows:

6 1. The Woodruff Defendants' motion to dismiss the First Amended
7 Complaint is granted without leave to amend and Defendants Woodruff
8 & Smart, APC, Jason M. McEwen, and Nicolas A. Hutchens are
9 dismissed from this action with prejudice; and

10 2. The City of Tustin Defendants' motion to dismiss the First Amended
11 Complaint is granted without leave to amend and Defendants City of
12 Tustin and Brad Steen are dismissed from this action with prejudice.

13
14 DATED: January 28, 2025

15 
16 _____
17 HON. R. GARY KLAUSNER
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28