IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION

JAMES BLUME, Plaintiff, v. LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURTS; LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPT.; STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPELLATE COURTS DIVISION; LOS ANGELES HOUSING DEPT. aka LAHCID, Defendants.	**MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER ADOPTING [9] REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO DISMISS** Case No. 2:17-cv-01155-DN-DBP District Judge David Nuffer

The Report and Recommendation[1] issued by United States Magistrate Judge Dustin B. Pead on January 9, 2018 recommends that the district judge dismiss plaintiff James Blume's complaint. The Magistrate Judge screened Mr. Blume's complaint under the federal *in forma pauperis* statute[2] and determined that Mr. Blume failed to state a claim or demonstrate a basis for the District of Utah to exercise jurisdiction over the named defendants.[3]

Mr. Blume timely filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation (the "Objection").[4] The Objection raises a number of points relative to Mr. Blume's general beliefs and positions about the court system and alleged violations of his rights.[5] However, the

[1] Report and Recommendation, docket no. 9, filed January 9, 2018.

[2] 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (requiring dismissal where the court determines that an action is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief).

[3] Report and Recommendation at pp. 2–3.

[4] Objection to Report and Recommendation, docket no. 11, filed January 26, 2018.

[5] *Id.*

Objection does not articulate specific intelligible objections to the reasoning or recommendations from the Magistrate Judge, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 636.[6] Therefore, the analysis and conclusion of the Magistrate Judge are accepted without *de novo* review,[7] and the Report and Recommendation is adopted in its entirety.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation[8] is ADOPTED and this case is DISMISSED with prejudice.

The Clerk is directed to close the case.

Dated January 30, 2018.

BY THE COURT:

David Nuffer
United States District Judge

[6] 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.").

[7] *Id.*

[8] Docket no. 9.