

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY DeMARTINI, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
MICHAEL DeMARTINI, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-2722 JAM CKD PS

AMENDED FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

On April 14, 2016, findings and recommendations were filed. ECF No. 99. Plaintiffs/counterdefendants have filed “objections” requesting clarification of an apparent inconsistency in the findings and recommendations. The objections are well taken; the court committed a clerical error in drafting the findings and recommendations.

Accordingly, THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, filed April 14, 2016 (ECF No. 99), ARE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:


- a. ECF No. 99 at 9:12, “Plaintiffs/counterclaimants . . .” is amended to read “Plaintiffs/counterdefendants . . .”
- b. ECF No. 99 at 12:12, “. . . be denied without prejudice to its renewal. . .” is amended to read “. . . be granted without prejudice to its renewal . . .”

These amended findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen

1 days after being served with these amended findings and recommendations, any party may file
2 written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be
3 captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file
4 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.

5 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

6 Dated: April 28, 2016



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 4 demartini2722.amd.f&r

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28