UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BARRY STUART HALAJIAN, Plaintiff, v. JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, NA, et al., Defendants.	No. 2:23-cv-1522-DJC-SCR ORDER

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this matter, which was referred to the magistrate judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

On April 29, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. ECF No. 75. Plaintiff was subsequently granted an extension of time to June 30, 2025 to file objections. ECF No. 78. Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations, ECF No. 80, and Defendant JP Morgan Chase Bank, NA, has filed a response, ECF No. 82.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

supported by the record and by proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations filed April 29, 2025 are adopted in full;

2. Defendants H&G and Trudell's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 43) is GRANTED without leave to amend and H&G and Trudell are dismissed from the action;

3. Defendant Chase's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 45) is GRANTED without leave to amend and Chase is dismissed from the action;

4. Defendant Ostrowski's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 51) is GRANTED without leave to amend and Ostrowski is dismissed from the action;

5. Plaintiff's request for entry of default against Defendants Bay Advance and CSMS (ECF No. 66) is DENIED and Defendant CSMS is dismissed from this action; and

6. The action is stayed as to Bay Advance, the sole remaining Defendant in this action, and the parties are directed to file a Status Report, including a copy of the Connecticut Appellate Court's ruling in case AC 47341 within seven days of the issuance of that decision; and

7. This matter is referred back to the assigned Magistrate Judge for all further pretrial proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **July 25, 2025**

Daniel J. Calabretta

Hon. Daniel J. Calabretta
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE