



1 objections. (Doc. No. 4.)

2 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the undersigned has  
3 conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including  
4 plaintiff's objections, the undersigned concludes the findings and recommendations are supported  
5 by the record and by proper analysis. Plaintiff's citation to the decision in *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358  
6 U.S. 1, 18 (1958) is no-responsive to the analysis set out in the findings and recommendations  
7 here, as that decision does not address either judicial immunity or the principle that a private  
8 attorney does not act under color of state law for purposes of § 1983.

9 Given the foregoing:

- 10 1. The findings and recommendations issued December 29, 2017 (Doc. No. 3) are adopted in  
11 full;
- 12 2. The motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 2) is denied;
- 13 3. Plaintiff's claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 are dismissed with prejudice;
- 14 4. Plaintiff's state law claims are dismissed for lack of jurisdiction;
- 15 5. Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed without leave to amend; and
- 16 6. The Clerk of the Court is directed to terminate any pending motions and close this case.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: February 12, 2018

19   
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28