

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

OLATUNJI RAHEEM,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZURICH NORTH AMERICA
INSURANCE,

Defendant.

No. 2:18-cv-2762-JAM-KJN PS

ORDER

On November 14, 2018, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations (ECF No. 3), which 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. On December 4, 2018, plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations (ECF No. 4), which have been considered by the court.

This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which an 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); see also Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). 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 matter on the applicable law. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s

1 conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d
2 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

3 The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,
4 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the findings and recommendations in full.

5 Documentation attached to plaintiff's objections suggests that plaintiff wishes to challenge the
6 deduction of certain amounts from worker's compensation benefits paid to plaintiff by defendant
7 Zurich based on a child support obligation. This court does not have jurisdiction to review child
8 support orders, and as the magistrate judge noted, plaintiff cannot state cognizable claims under
9 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 18 U.S.C. § 241 against defendant Zurich.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 11 1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 3) are adopted.
- 12 2. The action is dismissed without leave to amend.
- 13 3. Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this court (ECF No. 2) is denied as
14 moot.
- 15 4. The Clerk of Court shall close this case.

16 DATED: December 18, 2018

17 /s/ John A. Mendez

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28