

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

YVETTE BRAVO,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-1982 LKK EFB

vs.

THE UNITED STATES LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

ORDER


On November 13, 2009, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed by November 23, 2009. Defendant filed objections to the findings and recommendations on November 23, 2009 and they were considered by the undersigned.¹ On December 4, 2009, the magistrate judge filed amended findings and recommendations which were also served on the parties.

¹ Defendant also filed “objections” to the magistrate judge’s November 13, 2009 discovery order, which the magistrate judge construed as a motion for reconsideration and which the magistrate judge granted in part. To the extent the objections were also intended as a request for reconsideration by the district judge of the November 13 discovery order, pursuant to Local Rule 303(c) that request is denied.

1 This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to
2 which objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v.
3 Commodore Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920
4 (1982). As to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made,
5 the court assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law. See Orand v.
6 United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are
7 reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir.
8 1983).

9 The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,
10 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the proposed Findings and Recommendations in full.
11 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the discovery completion deadline of November 15, 2009 is
12 extended to November 30, 2009, for the limited purpose of permitting defendant to produce the
13 discovery at issue in the magistrate judge's November 13, 2009 order, and extended to December
14 11, 2009, for the limited purpose of permitting defendant to obtain, retrieve, redact, copy, and
15 produce the discovery at issue in the magistrate judge's December 4, 2009 order.

16 DATED: December 7, 2009.

17
18 
19 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
20 SENIOR JUDGE
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22
23
24
25
26