1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 COLLEEN STEWART, No. 2:17-cv-02418-TLN-KJN 11 **ORDER** Plaintiff, 12 v. 13 PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INSURANCE CO. OF HARTFORD, 14 Defendant. 15 16 Plaintiff Colleen Stewart ("Plaintiff"), currently proceeding pro se, brings this civil action 17 against Defendant Property and Casualty Insurance Co. of Hartford ("Defendant") for alleged 18 19 breach of insurance contract and bad faith. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate 20 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 21 On January 21, 2021, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which 22 were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen (14) days. (ECF No. 86.) No objections were 23 filed within those 14 days. However, after Plaintiff communicated with the courtroom deputy for 24 25 /// 26 Plaintiff was represented by counsel when she initiated this lawsuit in 2017, but counsel 27 subsequently moved to withdraw as Plaintiff's attorney in April 2019 and the Court granted 28 counsel's motion in March 2020. (ECF Nos. 42, 59.) Plaintiff proceeded pro se thereafter. 1

1	the magistrate judge that she had not received the Findings and Recommendations, the Court re-
2	served them on Plaintiff. No objections were filed by Plaintiff after this re-service. <sup>2</sup>
3	The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United States, 602
4	F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed <i>de novo</i> .
5	See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983); see also 28
6	U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
7	Having reviewed the file under the applicable legal standards, the Court finds the Findings
8	and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis.
9	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
10	1. The Findings and Recommendations (ECF No. 86) are ADOPTED IN FULL;
11	2. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 61) is GRANTED;
12	3. Judgment is entered for Defendant; and
13	4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.
15	DATED: March 17, 2021
<ul><li>16</li><li>17</li><li>18</li><li>19</li><li>20</li><li>21</li></ul>	Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge
<ul><li>22</li><li>23</li><li>24</li></ul>	The Court is aware that Plaintiff emailed complaints to the magistrate judge's courtroom deputy, despite being informed multiple times that she could not communicate with the Court by

The Court is aware that Plaintiff emailed complaints to the magistrate judge's courtroom deputy, despite being informed multiple times that she could not communicate with the Court by email. Further, service of the Findings and Recommendations at Plaintiff's South Tahoe residence was proper, given that this is the address Plaintiff listed with the Court, and Plaintiff failed to submit a change of residence with the Court. *See* E.D. Cal. L.R. 182(f) ("Each appearing attorney and pro se party is under a continuing duty to notify the Clerk and all other parties of any change of address or telephone number of the attorney or the pro se party. Absent such notice, service of documents at the prior address of the attorney or pro se party shall be fully effective.")