| 1  |  |                                     |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|
| 2  |  |                                     |
| 3  |  |                                     |
| 4  |  |                                     |
| 5  |  |                                     |
| 6  |  |                                     |
| 7  |  |                                     |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |                                     |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |                                     |
| 10 |  |                                     |
| 11 | ADRIAN POLEE,  | No. 2:22-cv-1538 DJC KJN P          |
| 12 | Plaintiff,   |                                     |
| 13 | ٧.   | <u>ORDER</u>                        |
| 14 | C. STAGGS-BOATRIGHT,   |                                     |
| 15 | Defendant.   |                                     |
| 16 |  |                                     |
| 17 | Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action seeking  |                                     |
| 18 | relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate   |                                     |
| 19 | Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.                         |                                     |
| 20 | On January 24, 2023, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and                           |                                     |
| 21 | recommendations herein which were served on Plaintiff and which contained notice to    |                                     |
| 22 | Plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed     |                                     |
| 23 | within fourteen days. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and           |                                     |
| 24 | recommendations.   |                                     |
| 25 | The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United          |                                     |
| 26 | States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law   |                                     |
| 27 | are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 |                                     |
| 28 | (9th Cir. 1983). Having reviewed the file  | e, the Court finds the findings and |
|    |  | 1                                   |

| 1  | recommendations to be supported by the record and by the Magistrate Judge's            |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2  | analysis.  |  |  |
| 3  | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:  |  |  |
| 4  | 1. The findings and recommendations filed January 24, 2023, are adopted in             |  |  |
| 5  | full; and  |  |  |
| 6  | 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice. <u>See</u> Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. |  |  |
| 7  | P. 41(b).  |  |  |
| 8  |  |  |  |
| 9  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 | Dated: May 12, 2023 Hon. Daniel J Galabretta   |  |  |
| 12 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE   |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |
| 15 | /pole22cv1538.800  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |
| 28 | 2  |  |  |
|    |  |  |  |