

FILED 10/23/09

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

DEBORAH ELLEN FRISCH,

O R D E R  
Civ. No. 09-6126-TC

Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF EUGENE, et al.,

Defendants.

---

AIKEN, Chief Judge:

Magistrate Judge Coffin filed his Amended Findings and Recommendation on November 23, 2009. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When a party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore

1 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert.  
2 denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

3 Plaintiff, appearing pro se, has timely filed objections.  
4 I have, therefore, given the file of this case a de novo review.  
5 I ADOPT the Magistrate's Amended Findings and Recommendation  
6 (doc. 89) that defendant Lane County's motion to dismiss (doc.  
7 21) is granted with prejudice. Defendant Lane County is  
8 therefore dismissed as a defendant in this action.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of February ~~January~~ 2010.

11  
12  
13 

14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 Ann Aiken  
16 United States District Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28