1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 KIM EDWARD ROGERS, No. 2:17-cv-00149-JAM-GGH 12 Plaintiff, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 M. RICHARD, CHP Commander, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff appears in this action pro and in forma pauperis. On March 7, 2018 this court 18 issued Findings and Recommendations that recommended that several of plaintiff's claims be 19 dismissed, several defendants be dismissed, and supplemental state claims be dismissed. ECF 20 No. 64. In issuing this document the court failed to give the parties an opportunity to object 21 before the matter was referred to the district judge assigned to the case for final action. It will do 22 so now. 23 In light of the foregoing IT IS HEREBY ORDEERED that: 1. 24 The parties shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of this Order to file and 25 serve written objections to the court's Findings and Recommendations, if any, to ECF No. 64, 26 dated March 7, 2018, and any such objections should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate 27 Judge's Findings and Recommendations. //// 28

2. Any Reply to the objections shall be served and filed within seven (7) days after service of the objections. These 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)(l). The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)." IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: April 26, 2018 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE