

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

ARIEL BALTHROPE,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-3003-KJM-JFM (PS)

vs.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY OF  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_/

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

On December 8, 2011, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir.

////

1 1983). Having carefully reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to  
2 be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations filed December 8, 2011 are adopted in full;
- 5 2. The July 14, 2011 motion to dismiss is granted with prejudice; and
- 6 3. The July 18, 2011 motion to dismiss is granted with prejudice.

7 DATED: January 25, 2012.

8   
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26