Espinoza v. Ortega et al Doc. 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROGELIO C. ESPINOZA,

Plaintiff,

v.

M. LOMELLI,

Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-06197-YGR (PR)

ORDER RE: REASSIGNMENT FROM A MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This suit was reassigned from a magistrate judge to the undersigned in light of a recent Ninth Circuit decision.[1] While this case was in the magistrate judge's hands, orders addressing various matters were issued. The Court regards the magistrate judge's orders as reports and recommendations from the magistrate judge to the undersigned. The parties may now offer objections to those reports and recommendations. Any objections must be filed with this Court on or before **February 26, 2018**. **No extensions of time will be granted.** If a party files no objection by that date, the Court will deem that party to have waived his right to object to the magistrate judge's reports and recommendations.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 24, 2018

YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
United States District Judge

[1] *Williams v. King*, 875 F.3d 500, 503 (9th Cir. 2017) (magistrate judge lacked jurisdiction to dismiss case on initial screening because unserved defendants had not consented to proceed before magistrate judge).

United States District Court
Northern District of California

Dockets.Justia.com