



1 reasons provided for in the January 31, 2017 screening order. *See* MJ Order at 5–6. The parties  
2 were advised that failure to file objections within fourteen days after being served with the  
3 findings and recommendations may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. *Martinez*  
4 *v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). *See generally* F&Rs.

5 The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*,  
6 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are  
7 reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court . . .”). Having reviewed the  
8 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the  
9 proper analysis. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979).

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 11 1. The magistrate judge’s recommendations filed June 21, 2021 (ECF No. 61) are adopted  
12 in full; and
- 13 2. Plaintiff’s due process claims against defendants Swarthout and Cappel for denying his  
14 disciplinary appeals are dismissed without leave to amend.

15 This order resolves ECF Nos. 61 & 62.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 DATED: July 12, 2021.

18   
\_\_\_\_\_  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE