1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CHRISTOPHER D. SCHNEIDER,	No. 2:11-cv-2953-JAM-EFB PS
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	BANK OF AMERICA N.A.; BANK OF AMERICA MORTGAGE; BANK OF	
15	AMERICA HOME LOANS SERVICING LP; BALBOA INSURANCE COMPANY;	
16	HOME RETENTION GROUP; QUALITY LOAN SERVICE CORPORATION;	
17	CLIFF COLER; and DOES 1-100, inclusive,	
18	Defendants.	
19 20		
20		
21	On September 11, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein	
22	which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings	
23	and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff filed objections on	
24 25	September 25, 2017, defendant timely filed a response to plaintiff's objections on October 5,	
25 26	2017, and those filings were considered by the undersigned.	
26 27	This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which existing has been made -28 U.S.C. § 626 (h)(1): MeDennell Daugles Corr. y. Commodere	
27	objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); <u>McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore</u> <u>Business Machines</u> , 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), <u>cert. denied</u> , 455 U.S. 920 (1982). As	
20	<u>Dusiness macinies</u> , 050 r.20 1507, 1515 (90	1

1	to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court	
2	assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law. See Orand v. United	
3	States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are	
4	reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).	
5	The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,	
6	concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the proposed Findings and Recommendations in full.	
7	Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:	
8	1. The proposed Findings and Recommendations filed September 11, 2017, are adopted;	
9	2. Plaintiff's motion for a new trial (ECF No. 297) is denied; and	
10	3. Defendant's motion to extend the time to file a response to plaintiff's objections (ECF	
11	No. 349) is denied as unnecessary.	
12	DATED: 10/12/2017	
13		
14	<u>/s/ John A. Mendez</u> JOHN A. MENDEZ	
15	United States District Court Judge	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	