

1 The parties were given fourteen days to file any objections to the recommendation that fees and
2 costs be awarded. Doc. 102 at 23. In addition, they were “advised that failure to file objections within
3 the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order.” *Id.* at 6 (citing *Martinez v.*
4 *Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991); *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 834 (9th Cir. 2014)). To
5 date, no objections have been filed.

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C) and *Britt v. Simi Valley United*
7 *School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983), this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case.
8 Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds that the Findings and Recommendations are
9 supported by the record and by proper analysis.

10 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- 11 1. The Findings and Recommendations dated May 25, 2017 (Doc. 102) are **ADOPTED**
12 **IN FULL;**
- 13 2. Defendant’s motion for attorney fees is **GRANTED** in the modified amount of
14 **\$246,758.67;**
- 15 3. The request for expert fees is **GRANTED** in the amount of **\$15,435.00;** and
- 16 4. The request for costs is **GRANTED** in the amount of **\$23,478.29.**

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: June 19, 2017

/s/ Lawrence J. O’Neill
20 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE