

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

MULUGETA ATSBAHA,

Plaintiff,

v.

WILLIAM BARR, ATTORNEY
GENERAL,

Defendant.

No. 2:19-cv-1462 KJM DB PS

ORDER

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se with the above-entitled action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by Local Rule 302(c)(21).

On February 6, 2020, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days after service of the findings and recommendations. The fourteen-day period has expired, and plaintiff has not filed any objections to the findings and recommendations.


The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *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 Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court

1 . . .”). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be
2 supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations filed February 6, 2020 (ECF No. 4) are adopted in
5 full; and
6 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice.

7 DATED: April 17, 2020.

8 
9 _____
10 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28