

1 this court to resolve; in fact, she confirms that the controversies in this case have been “settled.”⁸
2 To the extent that she now claims that the court should take action based on a document entitled
3 “Notice of Formal Ratification of Express Contract Nunc Pro Tunc,” ECF No. 10-2, that
4 document was executed on behalf of the defendants by Kenneth Taylor, a non-attorney, whom
5 this court has repeatedly indicated may not act on behalf of the defendants in this action.⁹ And
6 her objection that the magistrate judge lacks the power to take action in this case is meritless.
7 *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636 et seq.

8 Accordingly, had I received Bailey’s objections in a timely fashion, they would not have
9 changed my decision to adopt the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation and dismiss this
10 case. Even if I liberally construe her recent filings as a request for reconsideration of my
11 dismissal order, I find no basis to do so. Accordingly,

12 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff Viana Bailey’s objections [ECF No. 25] are
13 OVERRULED; and

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Viana Bailey’s Third Demand for Final
15 Judgment [ECF No. 27] is DENIED.

16 This case is closed.

17 DATED: July 27, 2017

18 
19 _____
20 Jennifer A. Dorsey
21 United States District Judge
22
23

24 ⁸ ECF No. 25 at 1.

25 ⁹ *See* ECF No. 10-2; 16 (minutes of hearing at which Taylor was advised he cannot act on behalf
26 of the defendants in court); 17 (order giving the defendants until 2/10/17 to retain counsel or file
27 a notice that they will appear pro se); 22 (R&R, noting that the defendants have “failed to comply
28 with this Court’s order” requiring them to retain counsel or file a notice with the court indicating
that they are appearing pro se).