1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 THR CALIFORNIA, L.P., No. 2:13-cv-2320 KJM CKD PS 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 STEVE TAYLOR, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Defendants, proceeding pro se, removed the above-entitled action from state court. The 18 matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge under Local Rule 302(c)(21). 19 On November 13, 2013, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which 20 were served on defendants and which contained notice to defendants that any objections to the 21 findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Defendants have not filed 22 objections to the findings and recommendations. 23 The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United States, 602 24 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 25 See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Having carefully 26 reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record 27 and by the proper analysis. 28 ///// 1

## 

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations filed November 13, 2013 are adopted in full; and
- 2. The above-entitled action is summarily remanded to the Superior Court of California,

County of San Joaquin, Lodi Judicial Branch.

DATED: December 19, 2013.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE