20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA STRATEGIC PARTNERS, LP, 10 11 Plaintiff, No. 2:12-cv-2803 LKK KJN PS 12 v. 13 ROBERT IJAMS, et al., 14 Defendants. ORDER 15 16 On November 19, 2012, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations 17 18 19

(dkt. no. 5) 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. On November 30, 2012, defendants filed objections to the findings and recommendations (dkt. no. 6), which have been considered by the court.

This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which an 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); see also Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). 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 motion 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. 1983).

The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing, concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the findings and recommendations in full. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations (dkt. no. 5) are ADOPTED;
- 2. The action is summarily remanded to the Placer County Superior Court;
- 3. The Clerk is directed to serve a certified copy of this order on the Clerk of the Placer County Superior Court, and shall reference the state case number (MCV0056000) in the proof of service; and

SENIOR JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

4. The Clerk is directed to close this case.

DATED: January 3, 2013.