

FILED**MAY 20 2016**Clerk, U.S. District Court
District Of Montana
MissoulaIN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA
MISSOULA DIVISION

TYRONE EVERETT PAYNE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PIP V. SAUKAM and THE MONTANA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
PROBATION AND PAROLE
DIVISION,

Defendants.

CV 15-158-M-DLC-JCL

ORDER

United States Magistrate Judge Jeremiah C. Lynch entered findings and recommendations in this case on April 28, 2016, recommending that Plaintiff Tyrone Everett Payne's ("Payne") Complaint be dismissed for failing to state claim upon which relief may be granted. Payne did not object to the findings and recommendations, and so has waived the right to de novo review thereof. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). This Court reviews for clear error those findings and recommendations to which no party objects. *See McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Bus. Mach., Inc.*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Clear error exists if the Court is left with a "definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." *United States v.*

Syrax, 235 F.3d 422, 427 (9th Cir. 2000) (citations omitted).


Having reviewed the findings and recommendations, the Court finds no clear error in Judge Lynch's conclusion that nothing about Defendant Saukam's report of violation and Payne's consequent revocation violated Payne's substantive due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Judge Lynch's findings and recommendations (Doc. 8) are ADOPTED IN FULL. This case is DISMISSED. The Clerk of Court shall CLOSE this matter and enter judgment pursuant to Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall have the docket reflect that the Court certifies, pursuant to Rule 24(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, that any appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall have the docket reflect that this dismissal counts as a strike pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

DATED this 20th day of May, 2016.



Dana L. Christensen, Chief Judge
United States District Court