UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHELSIE M. SANTILLAN, Plaintiff, v. CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINERS, et al., Defendants.	Case No. 2:24-cv-0571-DJC-JDP (PS) ORDER

This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On November 18, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice 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 . . . ."). Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The proposed Findings and Recommendations filed November 18, 2025, are ADOPTED;
2. Plaintiff's motion for default judgment, ECF No. 58, is DENIED; and
3. This matter is referred back to the assigned Magistrate Judge for all further pretrial matters.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **February 24, 2026**



Hon. Daniel J. Calabretta
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE