1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 TIRATH KAUR, No. 2:14-cv-0812 TLN AC PS 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. ORDER 14 DESMOND GORDON, 15 Defendant. 16 17 Defendant, proceeding pro se, removed the above-entitled action on April 1, 2014. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 72-302(c)(21). 18 19 On May 1, 2014, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which 20 were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Neither party has filed 21 22 objections to the findings and recommendations. 23 The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. 24 /// 25 26 <sup>1</sup> Due to an oversight in the Clerk's office, defendant was not served with these findings and recommendations at the time of their filing. See ECF No. 10. On May 20, 2014, however, 27 service was accomplished. Defendant, thus, had 14 days from the date of service to file 28 objections. 1

(PS) Kaur v. Gordon

Doc. 11

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The findings and recommendations filed May 1, 2014, are adopted in full; and 2. This action is remanded to the Sacramento County Superior Court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Dated: June 23, 2014 Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge /kaur0812.801