

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 GARY S. GRAY,

No. 2:08-cv-00433-MCE-DAD PS

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

ORDER

14 CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO,

15 Defendant.  
16 \_\_\_\_\_/

17 Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed the above-entitled admiralty action. The matter was  
18 referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 72-302(c)(21).

19 On December 15, 2008, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein  
20 which were served on the parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to  
21 the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days, and any reply was to be  
22 filed within ten days after the filing of objections. Plaintiff filed timely objections, and defendant  
23 filed a timely reply.

24 ///

25 ///


26 ///

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304,  
2 this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file,  
3 the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper  
4 analysis.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. The findings and recommendations filed December 15, 2008, are adopted in full;  
7 2. Defendant's November 4, 2008 motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 9) is granted pursuant to  
8 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6); and  
9 3. This action is dismissed with prejudice.

10 Dated: January 9, 2009

11   
12 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26