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 June 30, 2026, 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. Defendants filed objections on July 14, 2025, and they were considered by the undersigned.

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 with the exception that the undersigned agrees that, given the extensive litigation of this case to date, dismissal should be with prejudice.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The proposed Findings and Recommendations filed June 30, 2026, are adopted in part;
2. This action is DISMISSED with prejudice for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders for the reasons set forth in the April 10, 2026 order;
3. Defendants' Request for Proposed Briefing Schedule and Position Regarding Further Amendment, ECF No. 62, is DENIED; and
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **July 15, 2026**

Hon. Daniel J. Calabretta
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE