

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER DAVID KROHE,
Plaintiff,
v.
ZANDRA STEINHARDT,
Defendant.

No. 1:17-cv-00878-DAD-MJS

LEAD CASE

ORDER:

(1) ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS,

(2) CONSOLIDATING CASE NOS.

1:17-cv-00878-DAD-MJS,
1:17-cv-00881-DAD-MJS,
1:17-cv-00885-DAD-MJS, AND
1:17-cv-00889-DAD-MJS;

(3) ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSING CASE NOS.

1:17-cv-00881-DAD-MJS,
1:17-cv-00885-DAD-MJS, AND
1:17-cv-00889-DAD-MJS; AND

(4) DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND

(Doc. No. 16)

1 CHRISTOPHER D. KROHE,
2 Plaintiff,

No. 1:17-cv-00881-DAD-EPG

3 v.

4 ZANDRA K. STEINHARDT,
5 Defendant.

7 CHRISTOPHER D. KROHE,
8 Plaintiff,

No. 1:17-cv-00885-LJO-SKO

9 v.

10 ZANDRA K. STEINHARDT,
11 Defendant.

13 CHRISTOPHER D. KROHE,
14 Plaintiff,

No. 1:17-cv-00889-DAD-SKO

15 v.

16 ZANDRA STEINHARDT,
17 Defendant.

18
19 Plaintiff Christopher David Krohe proceeds *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this
20 complaint against Zandra Steinhardt. (Doc. No. 1.) The matter was referred to a United States
21 Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302 of the United States
22 District Court for the Eastern District of California.

23 On August 1, 2017, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint and
24 recommended that: (1) Case Nos. 1:17-cv-00881-DAD-MJS, 1:17-cv-00885-DAD-MJS, and
25 1:17-cv-00889-DAD-MJS, be consolidated with the instant case and thereafter administratively
26 closed; and (2) plaintiff's complaint, which is substantially identical to those in each of the other
27 consolidated cases, be dismissed without leave to amend due to lack of jurisdiction. (Doc. No.
28 16.) On August 21, 2017, plaintiff filed objections. (Doc. No. 17.) In those objections, plaintiff

1 agrees that the cases should be consolidated but objects to the dismissal of his complaint.

2 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a
3 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff's
4 objections, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and
5 by proper analysis. Plaintiff's objections do not address the jurisdictional defects described in the
6 findings and recommendations, nor do they otherwise establish a basis for federal subject matter
7 jurisdiction.

8 Accordingly,

- 9 1. The August 1, 2017 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 16) are adopted in full;
- 10 2. The following cases shall be consolidated:
 - 11 1:17-cv-00878-DAD-MJS,
 - 12 1:17-cv-00881-DAD-MJS,
 - 13 1:17-cv-00885-DAD-MJS, and
 - 14 1:17-cv-00889-DAD-MJS;
- 15 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to file a copy of this order in each of the above-
16 referenced consolidated cases;
- 17 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to administratively close Case Nos. 1:17-cv-00881-
18 DAD-MJS, 1:17-cv-00885-DAD-MJS, and 1:17-cv-00889-DAD-MJS;
- 19 5. Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed without leave to amend for lack of jurisdiction; and
- 20 6. The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate any pending motions and close this case.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: September 28, 2017

23 
24 _____
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28