

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MOHAMED YASIN,

Plaintiff,

Case No. C17-0237JLR

v.

ORDER

ICE DETENTION AND REMOVAL
OPERATIONS,

Defendant.

I. INTRODUCTION

This matter comes before the court on the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James P. Donohue (R&R (Dkt. # 9)), and Mr. Yasin’s objections thereto (Objections (Dkt. # 10)). Having carefully reviewed all of the foregoing, along with all other relevant documents, and the governing law, the court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. # 9) and DISMISSES Mr. Yasin’s complaint with prejudice.

//
//
//

ORDER DISMISSING CIVIL
RIGHTS COMPLAINT - 1

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A district court has jurisdiction to review a Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation on dispositive matters. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). "The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." *Id.* "A judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The court reviews de novo those portions of the report and recommendation to which specific written objection is made. *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). "The statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise." *Id.* When no objections are filed, the court need not review de novo the report and recommendation. *Wang v. Masaitis*, 416 F.3d 992, 1000 n.13 (9th Cir. 2005). Because Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, this court must interpret his complaint and objections liberally. *See Bernhardt v. Los Angeles Cnty.*, 339 F.3d 920, 925 (9th Cir. 2003).

III. DISCUSSION

None of Plaintiff's objections raise any novel issues that were not addressed by Magistrate Judge Donohue's Report and Recommendation. Moreover, the court has thoroughly examined the record before it and finds the Magistrate Judge's reasoning persuasive in the light of that record. Plaintiff essentially reargues the arguments he made to Magistrate Judge Donohue, and the court independently rejects them for the same reasons as Magistrate Judge Donohue.

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

IV. CONCLUSION


For the foregoing reasons, the court hereby ORDERS as follows:

- (1) The court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. # 9) in its entirety;
- (2) The court DISMISSES Plaintiff's proposed complaint (Dkt. # 7) with prejudice.

This dismissal shall count as a "strike" pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g); and

- (3) The court DIRECTS the Clerk to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and to Magistrate Judge Donohue.

DATED this 17th day of July, 2017.



JAMES L. ROBART
United States District Judge