1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 No. 2:19-cv-00466-TLN-CKD PRAKASH NARAYAN, 12 Plaintiff. 13 **ORDER** v. 14 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.. 15 Defendants. 16 17 On March 23, 2020, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations (ECF. No. 18 67) herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the 19 findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. On April 7, 2020, Plaintiff 20 filed objections to the proposed findings and recommendations (ECF. No. 68), which have been 21 considered by the Court. 22 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 23 24 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982); see also Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). As to any portion of the proposed 25 26 findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the Court assumes its correctness and 27 decides the motions on the applicable law. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th 28 Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi

1

Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). 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 23, 2020, are ADOPTED; 2. The City's motion to dismiss is GRANTED (ECF No. 54); and 3. Plaintiff's claims against the City are dismissed WITH PREJUDICE. DATED: April 20, 2020 Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge