I

| 1 | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 10 | JANDY, | | |
| 11 | Plaintiff, CIV-S-09-0909 LKK GGH PS | | |
| 12 | VS. | | |
| 13 | SECOND DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE | | |
| 14 | OF NEVADA IN WASHOE COUNTY, et al., | | |
| 15 | Defendant. <u>ORDER</u> | | |
| 16 | / | | |
| 17 | On September 1, 2009, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations | | |
| 18 | herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the | | |
| 19 | findings and recommendations were to be filed within ten days. No objections were filed. | | |
| 20 | Accordingly, the court presumes any findings of fact are correct. See Orland v. | | |
| 21 | United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1999). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are | | |
| 22 | reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. | | |
| 23 | 1983). | | |
| 24 | The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing, | | |
| 25 | concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the Findings and Recommendations in full. | | |
| 26 | | | |
| | 1 | | |

| 1 | | |
|----|------------|---|
| 1 | | Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that: |
| 2 | | 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed September 1, 2009, are ADOPTED; |
| 3 | and | |
| 4 | | 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice. |
| 5 | DATED: Nov | vember 12, 2009. |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | Jaunne K Ker tor |
| 8 | | LÀWRENCE K. KARLTON SENIOR JUDGE |
| 9 | | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| | | 2 |