

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  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL CHRISTOPHER AND CARREA  
CHRISTOPHER, Jr.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al,

Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-00748-KJM-JDP (PC)

ORDER

Plaintiffs, proceeding pro se, have filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 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 June 16, 2022, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on plaintiffs, and which contained notice to plaintiffs that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiffs have 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

1 . . .”). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be  
2 supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations filed June 16, 2022, are adopted in full;
- 5 2. Plaintiffs’ amended complaint, ECF No. 15, is dismissed without leave to amend for  
6 failure to state a cognizable claim; and
- 7 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

8 DATED: September 15, 2022.

9  
10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28