1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	DELTON L. TAYLOR,	No. 1:14-cv-01754-DAD-JDP (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	<u>ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND</u> <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
14	HARISHKUMAR PATEL, et al.,	(Doc. Nos. 79, 83)
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Delton L. Taylor is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a claim of deliberate	
18	indifference to serious medical needs under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a	
19	United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	The parties to this action reached a settlement agreement on March 20, 2018. (Doc. No.	
21	74.) The parties thereafter filed a stipulation and request for voluntary dismissal with prejudice.	
22	(Doc. No. 75.) Accordingly, on March 21, 2018, the court closed this case. (Doc. No. 76.)	
23	On October 17, 2018, plaintiff filed a "motion to enforce settlement agreement," seeking a	
24	court order "directing the California Department of Correction and Rehabilitation to comply with	
25	the Settlement Agreement Reached between both parties." (Doc. No. 79 at 2.) On November 9,	
26	2018, defendants filed a response to plaintiff's motion. (Doc. No. 81.)	
27	On March 14, 2019, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations	
28	recommending that plaintiff's motion to enforce the settlement agreement be denied for lack of	

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	<i>de novo</i> 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 Dale A. Dryd	
20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	