

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  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY ALLEN COLEMAN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
MELISSA LEA COLEMAN, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:20-CV-00548 TLN CKD PS  
**ORDER**

Plaintiff Timothy Allen Coleman (“Plaintiff”) proceeds *pro se* in this civil action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On November 8, 2020, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein 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. (ECF No. 5.) On November 20, 2020, Plaintiff filed Objections to the Findings and Recommendations. (ECF No. 6.)

This Court reviews *de novo* those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), *cert. denied*, 455 U.S. 920 (1982); *see*

1 also *Dawson v. Marshall*, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). As to any portion of the proposed  
2 findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the Court assumes its correctness and  
3 decides the motions on the applicable law. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th  
4 Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed *de novo*. See *Britt v. Simi*  
5 *Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

6 Having carefully reviewed the entire file under the applicable legal standards, the Court  
7 finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate  
8 judge's analysis.

9 In his Objections, Plaintiff reiterates the merits of his due process claims asserted in the  
10 First Amended Complaint but does not address the magistrate judge's findings that his action is  
11 prohibited by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's objections are therefore overruled.

12 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:


13 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed November 18, 2020 (ECF No. 5), are  
14 adopted in full;

15 2. Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 4) is DISMISSED without leave to  
16 amend; and

17 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED: December 14, 2020

20  
21  
22   
23 Troy L. Nunley  
24 United States District Judge  
25  
26

27 <sup>1</sup> Under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, a federal district court does not have subject matter  
28 jurisdiction to hear a direct appeal from the final judgment of a state court. See *Noel v. Hall*, 341  
F.3d 1148, 1154-55 (9th Cir. 2003).