

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

ANGELA NUNES, et al.,  
  
  Plaintiffs,  
  
  v.  
  
COUNTY OF STANISLAUS, et al.,  
  
  Defendants.

No. 1:19-cv-00204-DAD-SAB

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND GRANTING  
PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF  
THE MINORS’ COMPROMISE

(Doc. Nos. 78, 89, 90)

On February 12, 2019, plaintiffs Angelina Nunes, Emanuel Alves, and minors D.X. and L.X. by and through their guardian *ad litem* Angelina Nunes (collectively “plaintiffs”) filed the pending action against defendants Arata, Swingle, Van Egmond & Goodwin (PLC) and the County of Stanislaus, alleging unauthorized and unconstitutional access and distribution of plaintiffs’ confidential juvenile casefile records. (Doc. No. 1.) This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On March 21, 2022, plaintiffs filed a petition seeking approval of the parties’ settlement and minors’ compromise.<sup>1</sup> (Doc. No. 78.) On May 24, 2022, defendants filed statements of non-

<sup>1</sup> The parties filed a nearly identical petition in the related action *Nunes v. County of Stanislaus*, No. 17-cv-00633-DAD-SAB (*Nunes I*), because the parties’ settlement resolves both actions. The assigned magistrate judge issued separate findings and recommendations on the docket in *Nunes I* to address that petition, and the undersigned will issue an order on the docket in *Nunes I* to address those findings and recommendations.

1 opposition to the pending petition. (Doc. Nos. 86, 87.) On May 31, 2022, the assigned  
2 magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiffs' petition for  
3 approval of the minors' compromise be granted and that the parties' settlement be approved.  
4 (Doc. No. 89 at 10.) The findings and recommendations contained notice that any objections  
5 were to be filed within fourteen (14) days. To date, no objections to the findings and  
6 recommendations have been filed, and the time in which to do so has passed.

7 On June 13, 2022, the parties filed a stipulation to dismiss this action with prejudice.<sup>2</sup>  
8 (Doc. No. 90.)

9 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a  
10 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the  
11 findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

12 Accordingly:

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations issued on May 31, 2022 (Doc. No. 89) are  
14 adopted in full;
- 15 2. Plaintiffs' petition to approve settlement of the minors' claims (Doc. No. 78)  
16 is granted;
- 17 3. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation (Doc. No. 90), this action is dismissed with  
18 prejudice; and
- 19 4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: June 21, 2022

22   
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23  
24  
25 <sup>2</sup> Although the parties' stipulation states that they stipulate to the dismissal of *Nunes I* as well, the  
26 parties in *Nunes I* have not yet filed a similar stipulation on the docket in that case. Accordingly,  
27 the court will not dismiss the *Nunes I* action based upon the stipulation filed by the parties in this  
28 action. The undersigned notes, however, that the court will issue an order which will be docketed  
in the *Nunes I* action directing the parties in that action to file either a stipulation or a request for  
dismissal of that action.