

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

MP APW LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

EDWARD MADRIGAL, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-2905 KJM CKD PS

ORDER

Defendants, proceeding pro se, removed the above-entitled action from state court. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge under Local Rule 302(c)(21).

On January 8, 2015, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on defendants and which contained notice to defendants that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Defendants have not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *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). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

////

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations filed January 8, 2015 are adopted in full; and
2. The above-entitled action is summarily remanded to the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento.

DATED: February 6, 2015


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE