Lukens v. Angelozzi et al Doc. 50

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

TROY LUKENS,

Plaintiff, No 3:14-cv-00959-TC

V.

HEIDI STEWARD, et al.,

Defendants. ORDER

HERNANDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Coffin issued a Findings and Recommendation [14] on September 11, 2014, in which he recommends that this Court grant Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint [8] and dismiss *sua sponte* defendants Michael D. Schrunk, Irene B. Taylor, and "the Office of Public Defense Service." The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the

Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); <u>Dawson v. Marshall</u>, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); <u>United States v. Reyna-Tapia</u>, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).

I have carefully considered Plaintiff's objections and conclude there is no basis to modify the Findings & Recommendation. I have also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and find no other errors in the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Coffin's Findings & Recommendation [14].

Accordingly, defendants Michael D. Schrunk, Irene B. Taylor, and "the Office of Public Defense Service" are dismissed; and Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint [8] is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____ day of _______, 2014.

MARCO A. HERNANDEZ United States District Judge