1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	SERGEI PORTNOY,	No. 2:19-cv-1863-KJM-KJN (PS)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER
13	V.	(ECF Nos. 1 and 2.)
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On September 23, 2019, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations (ECF	
18	No. 3), 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 October 1, 2019,	
20	plaintiff filed objections to the proposed findings and recommendations (ECF. No. 4), which have	
21	been considered by the court.	
22	This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which an	
23	objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore	
24	Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981); see also Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d	
25	930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). As to any portion of	of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection
26	has been made, the court assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law.	
27	See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's	
28	/////	
		1

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. Accordingly,	
5	IT IS ORDERED that:	
6	1. The Findings and Recommendations (ECF No. 3), are ADOPTED IN FULL;	
7	2. The action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE; and	
8	3. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case.	
9	DATED: April 17, 2020.	
10	InA mal	
11	CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	