

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

KIRK MATTHEW SCHULTZ, et al.,

No. 2:11-cv-01796 MCE GGH PS

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ORDER

PETER W. KRAUSE, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

On December 13, 2011, 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 within fourteen (14) days. Objections were filed, and they were considered by the district judge.


This Court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). As to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979).

1 The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley  
2 Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

3 The Court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,  
4 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the Findings and Recommendations in full. Accordingly,  
5 IT IS ORDERED that:

- 6 1. Nationwide's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 16) is GRANTED and Nationwide's  
7 motion for a more definite statement is DENIED as moot;
- 8 2. The action is DISMISSED with prejudice; and
- 9 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

10 Dated: January 6, 2012

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