

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

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  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ADIL HIRAMANNEK, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
L. MICHAEL CLARK, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 5:13-cv-00228-RMW

**ORDER ON OBJECTION TO  
MAGISTRATE’S ORDER (DKT. NO.  
240) AND NON-CONSENSUAL  
REFERRAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 254

Plaintiff Roda Hiramaneck objects to the magistrate judge’s “Order Denying Ex Parte Application Objecting to Referral to a Magistrate Judge” (Dkt. No. 240). In the objection presently before the court, Plaintiff renews<sup>1</sup> her objection that she did not consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction. As the magistrate judge’s order explained, consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction is not required when the case has been referred to a magistrate judge for discovery purposes. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.

The magistrate judge’s order is **AFFIRMED**.

Dated: September 4, 2015

Ronald M. Whyte  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> See Dkt. No. 238.