

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

MAI VANG,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-1621 MCE DAD PS

vs.

LUELLA HUDSON, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se with the above-entitled action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21).

On March 16, 2010, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice to the parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within seven days after being served with the findings and recommendations. The seven-day period has expired, and no party has filed an objection to the findings and recommendations.

The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis.

////


////

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations filed March 16, 2010 (Doc. No. 41) are adopted in full;
2. Defendant SHRA's June 17, 2009 motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 5) is granted;
3. Plaintiff's claims against defendant SHRA are dismissed with prejudice, and defendant SHRA is dismissed from this action; and
4. This action shall proceed only on plaintiff's claims against defendant Hudson and defendant City Building Code Enforcement Department.

Dated: April 2, 2010


MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE