

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

CHARLES L. DAVIS,
Plaintiff,
v.
JERRY DOE, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:19-cv-01299-DAD-EPG

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. No. 7)

Plaintiff Charles L. Davis is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On May 27, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued the pending findings and recommendations, recommending that this action be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Doc. No. 7.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within twenty-one (21) days after service. Plaintiff has not filed any objections, and the time in which to do so has since passed.¹

////

¹ The court notes that, prior to issuing the pending findings and recommendations, on April 16, 2020, the magistrate judge also ordered plaintiff to show cause in writing why the action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction (Doc. No. 6), and plaintiff did not respond to that order to show cause either.

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, the
2 court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the court
3 finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

4 Accordingly,

- 5 1. The findings and recommendations issued on May 27, 2020 (Doc. No. 7) are
6 adopted in full;
- 7 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice due to lack of subject matter
8 jurisdiction; and
- 9 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: July 17, 2020

12 
13 _____
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28