UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARY JO SAAVEDRA,

Plaintiff,

v.

RIDDELL MACKEY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-01587-KJM-JDP (PS)

ORDER

Plaintiff's motion for entry of default judgment was submitted for decision without oral argument by the magistrate judge on August 7, 2023. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by Local Rule 302(c)(19) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

On February 12, 2024, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which contained notice to the parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. No objections were filed.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court

/////

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

. . . .”). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The Findings and Recommendations filed February 12, 2024, are adopted in full;

2. Plaintiff’s motion for default judgment, ECF No. 46, is denied without prejudice; and

3. This matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for all further pretrial proceedings.

DATED: March 21, 2024.

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE