

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

CD ALSTON

Plaintiff,

No. CIV-S-11-2078 JAM GGH PS

vs.

PAUL TASSONE, et al.

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

On November 15, 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 on November 29, 2011, 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). 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).

2           The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,  
3 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the Findings and Recommendations in full. Accordingly,  
4 IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order and a preliminary  
5 injunction (dkt. no. 9) is denied.

6 DATED: December 15, 2011

7

8

/s/ John A. Mendez  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26