

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

JEFFERSON A. McGEE,
Plaintiff,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-1796-JAM-EFB PS

ORDER

On March 3, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff filed objections on March 20, 2017, and they were considered by the undersigned.

This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). As to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law. 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 Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

////

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

The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing, concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the proposed Findings and Recommendations in full.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The proposed Findings and Recommendations filed March 3, 2017, are adopted;
2. The County of Sacramento and State of California’s motions to dismiss (ECF Nos. 13, 22) are granted and all claims against these defendants are dismissed without leave to amend;
and
3. Plaintiff’s motion for default judgment (ECF No. 15) is denied.

DATED: April 19, 2017

/s/ John A. Mendez

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE