



1 subject-matter jurisdiction. (Doc. No. 83.) Those findings and recommendations were served on  
2 the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14)  
3 days of service of that order. (*Id.* at 3.) After receiving extensions of time with which to file his  
4 objections (*see* Doc. Nos. 85, 87), plaintiff timely filed objections to the findings and  
5 recommendations on May 20, 2019. (Doc. No. 88.)

6 In his objections, plaintiff merely reiterates the arguments of his motion. (*See generally*  
7 Doc. No. 88.) However, plaintiff fails therein to address the magistrate judge's finding that this  
8 court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over enforcement of the settlement agreement. (*Id.*)

9 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a  
10 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings  
11 and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

12 Accordingly,

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations issued on March 14, 2019 (Doc. No. 83) are  
14 adopted in full;
- 15 2. Plaintiff's motion for post-judgment relief (Doc. No. 79) is denied for lack of  
16 subject-matter jurisdiction; and
- 17 3. This case remains closed.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: June 28, 2019

20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28