	Case 2:19-cv-01663-TLN-KJN Docume	ent 71 Filed 08/02/21 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CHARLES HEAD,	No. 2:19-cv-01663-TLN-KJN
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER
14	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Charles Head ("Plaintiff"), a prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil	
18	action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §	
19	636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On June 3, 2021, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which	
21	were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the	
22	findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 67.) Neither	
23	party has filed timely objections to the findings and recommendations.	
24	The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United States, 602	
25	F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed <i>de novo</i> .	
26	See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).	
27	The Court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be	
28	supported by the record and by the magistrate	e judge's analysis.
		1

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 2 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed June 3, 2021 (ECF No. 67), are ADOPTED 3 IN FULL; 4 2. Defendant Kenneth Shelton's ("Defendant") Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 54) is 5 GRANTED as to Plaintiff's state law claim and DENIED as to Plaintiff's Wiretap Act claim; and 6 3. Within thirty (30) days of the date of electronic filing date of this Order, Defendant 7 shall file a response to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. 7 shall file a response to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. 8 T IS SO ORDERED. 9 DATED: July 30, 2021 10 Junied States District Judge 11 Troy L. Nuhley? 12 United States District Judge 13 Intervention of the state stat		Case 2:19-cv-01663-TLN-KJN Document 71 Filed 08/02/21 Page 2 of 2	
 IN FULL; 2. Defendant Kenneth Shelton's ("Defendant") Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 54) is GRANTED as to Plaintiff's state law claim and DENIED as to Plaintiff's Wiretap Act claim; and 3. Within thirty (30) days of the date of electronic filing date of this Order, Defendant shall file a response to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: July 30, 2021 JATED: July	1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
4 2. Defendant Kenneth Shelton's ("Defendant") Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 54) is 5 GRANTED as to Plaintiff's state law claim and DENIED as to Plaintiff's Wiretap Act claim; and 6 3. Within thirty (30) days of the date of electronic filing date of this Order, Defendant 7 shall file a response to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. 8 IT IS SO ORDERED. 9 DATED: July 30, 2021 10 July 30, 2021 11 IT IS SO ORDERED. 12 July 30, 2021 13 Troy L. Nunley: United States District Judge 14 It Is Interventer 15 It Is Interventer 16 It Is Interventer 17 It Is Interventer 18 It Is Interventer 19 It Is Interventer 10 It Is Interventer 11 It Is Interventer 12 It Is Interventer 13 It Is Interventer 14 It Is Interventer 15 It Is Interventer 16 It Is Interventer 17 It Is Interventer 18 It Is Interventer	2	1. The Findings and Recommendations filed June 3, 2021 (ECF No. 67), are ADOPTED	
 GRANTED as to Plaintiff's state law claim and DENIED as to Plaintiff's Wiretap Act claim; and Within thirty (30) days of the date of electronic filing date of this Order, Defendant shall file a response to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: July 30, 2021 Troy L. Nunley. United States District Judge 	3	IN FULL;	
 3. Within thirty (30) days of the date of electronic filing date of this Order, Defendant shall file a response to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: July 30, 2021 Troy L. Nunley? United States District Judge 	4	2. Defendant Kenneth Shelton's ("Defendant") Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 54) is	
 shall file a response to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: July 30, 2021 Troy L. Nuhley: United States District Judge 	5	GRANTED as to Plaintiff's state law claim and DENIED as to Plaintiff's Wiretap Act claim; and	
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: July 30, 2021 July <	6	3. Within thirty (30) days of the date of electronic filing date of this Order, Defendant	
9 DATED: July 30, 2021 10 July 30, 2021 11 July 30, 2021 12 July 30, 2021 13 Troy L. Nunley? 14 United States District Judge 15 Inited States District Judge 16 Inited States District Judge 17 Inited States District Judge 18 Inited States District Judge 19 Inited States District Judge 20 Inited States District Judge 21 Inited States District Judge 22 Inited States District Judge 23 Inited States District Judge 24 Inited States District Judge	7	shall file a response to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint.	
10 11 12 11 13 12 13 13 14 15 15 16 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 14	8	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
11 Image: Construct of the second	9	DATED: July 30, 2021	
12 Troy L. Nuhley: 13 United States District Judge 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 25	10		
United States District Judge United States Di	11	My - Muntal	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	12		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	13		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	14		
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	15		
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	16		
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	17		
20 21 22 23 24 25	18		
21 22 23 24 25	19		
22 23 24 25	20		
23 24 25	21		
24 25	22		
25	23		
26			
27			
28	28	2	