## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HERIBERTO MENDOZA,

Petitioner,

v.

ORDER

SULLIVAN, Warden,

Respondent.

Petitioner, a former state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On December 30, 2019, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on petitioner and which contained notice to petitioner that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. ECF No. 12. Petitioner has not filed 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 . . . . ."). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be

1	supported by the record and by the proper analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED
2	that:
3	1. The findings and recommendations filed December 30, 2019, are adopted in full; and
4	2. This action is dismissed, without prejudice, for lack of prosecution and for failure to
5	comply with the court's order. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Local Rule 110.
6	DATED: August 8, 2020.
7	10 A m. 10
8	CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	