28

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 No. 2:22-cv-01058-TLN-KJN CHAD CREEL, 12 Plaintiff. **ORDER** 13 v. 14 SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 On July 5, 2022, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, (ECF No. 3), 18 which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings 19 and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. On July 12, 2022, Plaintiff filed 20 objections to the findings and recommendations, (ECF No. 4), which have been considered by the 21 Court. 22 This Court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which an objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore 23 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 the proposed findings of fact to which no objection 26 has been made, a court assumes its correctness and decides the matter on the applicable law. See 27 Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of

law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th

Cir. 1983). The Court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing, concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the findings and recommendations in full. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed July 5, 2022, (ECF No. 3), are adopted in full; 2. The action is DISMISSED with prejudice; and 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. **DATED: July 22, 2022** Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge