

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

CRAIG D. ALLEN,
Plaintiff,
v.
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, et
al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-00214 MCE GGH

ORDER

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this action brought pursuant to alleged Fourteenth Amendment violations under 28 U.S.C. section 1983.

On May 8, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein, recommending that to the extent Plaintiff's Complaint attempts to plead a claim under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, Defendant Superior Court's Motion to Dismiss should be granted. In all other respects the motion should be denied. ECF No. 38. In that Order, the magistrate judge provided the parties twenty-one days in which to object to the findings and recommendations. No objections have been filed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 303, this Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper

1 analysis.


2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

3 1. The findings and recommendations filed May 8, 2017, ECF No. 38, are
4 ADOPTED IN FULL;

5 2. Defendant Superior Court's Motion to Dismiss is DENIED except with respect to
6 Plaintiff's attempt to claim a violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment,
7 in which particular, it is GRANTED.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: July 20, 2017

10 
11 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28