pw

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

2627

28

FILED
FEB 0 1 2018

CLERK US DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFO DEI COURT DE COURT

## SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CLYDE REGINALD ELLIS,

Plaintiff.

1 mili

OFFICER BRADY, SAN DIEGO SHERIFF'S OFFICE DOES 1-7,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 16CV1419-WQH-NLS

**ORDER** 

HAYES, Judge:

V.

The matter before the Court is the review of the Report and Recommendation issued by United States Magistrate Judge recommending that the motion for summary judgment filed by the Officer Brady (ECF No. 19) be granted. (ECF No. 36).

The duties of the district court in connection with a report and recommendation of a magistrate judge are set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The district judge must "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report . . . to which objection is made," and "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The district court need not review de novo those portions of a Report and Recommendation to which neither party objects. See Wang v. Masaitis, 416 F.3d 992, 1000 n.13 (9th Cir. 2005); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) ("Neither the Constitution nor the [Federal Magistrates

Act] requires a district judge to review, de novo, findings and recommendations that the parties themselves accept as correct."). No party has filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation.

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation, the record, and the submissions of the parties. The Court finds that the Magistrate Judge correctly recommended that the Court strike Plaintiff's declaration, grant the motion for summary judgment filed by Defendant Officer Brady, and dismiss the Doe Defendants. The Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims as recommended by the Magistrate Judge.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 36) is adopted in its entirety. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for summary judgment filed by the Officer Brady (ECF No. 19) is granted and the claims against Doe Defendants are dismissed. The Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims. The Clerk is ordered to enter judgment in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff and to close the case.

Dated:

28

WILLIAM Q. HAYES

United States District Judge