1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 11 11 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 13 14	
2 3 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 11 LIUDMYLA IEGOROVA, No. 2:19-cv-1551 MCE AC (PS) 12 Plaintiff, No. 2:19-cv-1551 MCE AC (PS)	
3 4 4 5 5 6 7 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 11 LIUDMYLA IEGOROVA, No. 2:19-cv-1551 MCE AC (PS) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v.	
45678UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA1011LIUDMYLA IEGOROVA,No. 2:19-cv-1551 MCE AC (PS)12Plaintiff,13v.ORDER	
678UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA1011LIUDMYLA IEGOROVA,12Plaintiff,13v.ORDER	
78UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA101011LIUDMYLA IEGOROVA,No. 2:19-cv-1551 MCE AC (PS)12Plaintiff,13v.ORDER	
8UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA10IIIUDMYLA IEGOROVA,11No. 2:19-cv-1551 MCE AC (PS)12Plaintiff,13v.0RDER	
9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA1011111112Plaintiff,13v.ORDER	
1011LIUDMYLA IEGOROVA,No. 2:19-cv-1551 MCE AC (PS)12Plaintiff,13v.ORDER	
11LIUDMYLA IEGOROVA,No. 2:19-cv-1551 MCE AC (PS)12Plaintiff,13v.ORDER	
12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER	
13 v. <u>ORDER</u>	
14 LAMIE THOMPSON	
15 Defendant.	
16	
17 Plaintiff, proceeding prose, filed the above-entitled action. The matter was referred to	a
18 United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21).	
19 On September 27, 2019, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations here	in
20 which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the	ie
21 findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty-one days. ECF No. 3. Plaintiff	has
22 not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.	
23 The Court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be	
24 supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY	
25 ORDERED that:	
261. The findings and recommendations filed September 27, 2019, (ECF No. 3) are	
27 ADOPTED in full; and	
28 2. Plaintiff's request to proceeded in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is GRANTED but the	ie
1	1

1	complaint (ECF No. 1) is DISMISSED with prejudice because it fails to state a claim upon which
2	relief can be granted. Leave to amend will not be granted because amendment would be futile.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: November 19, 2019
5	Molen Il i.
6	MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2