

1 2016, Plaintiff filed an objection to the Magistrate Judge's findings. (ECF No. 37.)
2 Plaintiff's one-page objection argues, without explaining why, that Plaintiff should be
3 allowed to amend to cure the identified deficiencies in his Due Process claims. (Id.)

4 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304,
5 the Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the
6 entire file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the
7 record and by proper analysis. Plaintiff's objection has been considered and found to
8 lack merit. Plaintiff was granted three opportunities to attempt to amend his claims to
9 make them cognizable and each time he failed to adhere to the applicable pleading
10 standards. Given this history and the objections, there is no reasonable basis to
11 conclude that Plaintiff can plead a cognizable claim. See Telesaurus VPC, LLC v. Power,
12 623 F.3d 998, 1003 (9th Cir. 2010) (holding that leave to amend need not be granted when the
13 plaintiff has be given repeated opportunities to correct deficiencies).

14 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 15 1. The Court adopts the findings and recommendations filed on December 14
16 2016 (ECF No. 36) in full;
- 17 2. This case is DISMISSED with prejudice for failure to state a claim;
- 18 3. Dismissal counts as a STRIKE pursuant to the "three-strikes" provision of
19 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g); and
- 20 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate all pending motions and close
21 this case.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: February 8, 2017

24 
25 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE