1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	ANGELA NUNES, et al.,	No. 1:17-cv-00633-DAD-SAB	
12	Plaintiffs,		
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND	
14	COUNTY OF STANISLAUS, et al.,	RECOMMENDATIONS AND GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF	
15	Defendants.	THE MINORS' COMPROMISE	
16		(Doc. Nos. 91, 97)	
17	On May 5, 2017, plaintiffs Angelina Nunes, Emanuel Alves, and minors D.X. and L.X. by		
18	and through their guardian ad litem Angelina Nunes (collectively "plaintiffs") filed the pending		
19	action against defendants County of Stanislaus, Kristen Johnson, and Eric Anderson, asserting		
20	that the minors were wrongfully removed from the custody of their parents. (Doc. No. 1.) This		
21	matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and		
22	Local Rule 302.		
23	On March 21, 2022, plaintiffs filed a petition seeking approval of the parties' settlement		
24	and minors' compromise. ¹ (Doc. No. 91.) On May 17, 2022, defendants filed a statement of non-		
25			
26	¹ The parties filed a nearly identical petition in the related action <i>Nunes v. County of Stanislaus</i> , No. 19-cv-00204-DAD-SAB (<i>Nunes II</i>), because the parties' settlement resolves both actions.		
27	The assigned magistrate judge issued separate findings and recommendations on the docket in		
28	<i>Nunes II</i> to address that petition, and the under to address those findings and recommendation	signed will issue on order on the docket in <i>Nunes II</i> s.	
	-	1	

1	opposition to the pending petition. (Doc. No. 95.) On May 31, 2022, the assigned magistrate		
2	judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiffs' petition for approval of		
3	the minors' compromise be granted and that the parties' settlement be approved. (Doc. No. 97 at		
4	9.) The findings and recommendations contained notice that any objections were to be filed		
5	within fourteen (14) days. To date, no objections to the findings and recommendations have been		
6	filed, and the time in which to do so has passed.		
7	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a		
8	de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the		
9	findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.		
10	Accordingly:		
11	1.	The findings and recommendations issued on May 31, 2022 (Doc. No. 97) are	
12		adopted in full;	
13	2.	Plaintiffs' petition to approve settlement of the minors' claims (Doc. No. 91)	
14		is granted;	
15	3.	The parties are directed to file a stipulation for dismissal or a request for dismissal	
16		of this action, consistent with the parties' settlement, within fourteen (14) days	
17		from the date of this order; and	
18	4.	This matter is referred back to the magistrate judge for further proceedings	
19		consistent with this order.	
20	IT IS SO OR		
21	Dated:	June 21, 2022 Dale A. Drogd	
22		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		2	