## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

SEAN L. HARTFIELD,

No. 3:16-cv-00068-ST

Plaintiff,

v.

OREGON STATE BAR, and Unknown Individuals (J. Does Nos. 1-10),

ORDER

Defendants.

HERNANDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Stewart issued a Findings & Recommendation (#5) on January 15,

2016, in which she recommends the Court dismiss this action with prejudice for lack of subject

matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff has timely filed objections to the Findings & Recommendation.

The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) 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 Stewart's Findings & Recommendation [5], and therefore, this action is dismissed with prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this day of <u>e.)(1114</u>, 2016.

miten

MARCO A. HERNÁNDEZ United States District Judge