

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

ELLEN ROSE ROBINSON, et al.,

 Plaintiffs,

 v.

PLACER COUNTY, et al.,

 Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-02037-TLN-JDP

ORDER

On July 13, 2022, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 32.) No objections were filed.¹

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 supported by

¹ Although it appears from the file that Plaintiffs’ copy of the findings and recommendations were returned, Plaintiffs were properly served. It is Plaintiffs’ responsibility to keep the Court apprised of their current addresses at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

1 the record and by the proper analysis.

2 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

3 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed July 13, 2022 (ECF No. 32) are ADOPTED
4 in full;


5 2. This action is DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to prosecute and failure to
6 comply with court orders;

7 3. All pending motions (ECF Nos. 7, 10, 13, 16, 23, 24) are DENIED as moot; and

8 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case.

9 **DATED: September 14, 2022**

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


Troy L. Nunley
United States District Judge