I

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	KENNETH HARVEY,	No. 2:12-cv-02029-KJM-AC
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	J. BARBOUR,	
15	Defendant.	
16		
17		
18	This matter is before the court on defendant J. Barbour's request for	
19	reconsideration of the magistrate judge's April 25, 2016 order denying defendant's motion to	
20	dismiss for failure to state a claim and requiring defendant to answer the second amended	
21	complaint (ECF No. 36). Defendant contends the magistrate judge lacks jurisdiction to finally	
22	decide defendant's motion to dismiss under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), because the parties did not	
23	consent to the jurisdiction of a United States magistrate judge. ECF No. 37 at 1, 4–5 (citing 28	
24	U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 73; Dixon v. Ylst, 990 F.2d 478, 479 (9th Cir. 1993)).	
25	Defendant requests that the court vacate the April 25, 2016 order and direct the magistrate judge	
26	to instead submit proposed findings of fact and recommendations for disposition. Id. at 5.	
27	Alternatively, if the court construes the April 25, 2016 order as findings and recommendations,	
28		
		1

1	defendant objects to the findings and recommendations and requests that the court conduct a de	
2	novo review of defendant's motion to dismiss. Id.	
3	In the interest of judicial economy, the court construes the April 25, 2016 order as	
4	findings and recommendations and conducts a <i>de novo</i> review of defendant's motion to dismiss in	
5	accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304(f). Having	
6	carefully reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by	
7	the record and by proper analysis.	
8	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
9	1. The court construes the magistrate judge's April 25, 2016 order as findings	
10	and recommendations, which the court adopts in full; and	
11	2. The court denies defendant's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 32). Defendant	
12	shall file an answer to the second amended complaint within fourteen (14)	
13	days of the date this order is filed.	
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	DATED: June 22, 2016	
16	In A mulle	
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	2	