

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Toepfer v. City of Vallejo

Toepfer · No. 2:24-cv-02366-KJM-CSK · Decided June 20, 2025

OPINION

(PS) Toepfer v. City of Vallejo

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 ROBERT TOEPFER, et al., Case No. 2:24-cv-02366-KJM-CSK 11 Plaintiffs, ORDER 12 v.
13 CITY OF VALLEJO, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 On April 23, 2025, the magistrate judge filed
findings and recommendations, which were 17 served on the parties and which contained notice
that any objections to the findings and 18 recommendations were to be filed within fourteen (14)
days. (ECF No. 25.) No objections were 19 filed and the time to do so has passed. 20 The court
presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 21 602 F.2d 207, 208
(9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de 22 novo. See *Robbins*
v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by 23 the magistrate
judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court 24 . . .”). Having
reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be 25 supported by the
record and by the proper analysis. 26 ///// 27 ///// 28 /////] Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY
ORDERED that: 2 1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 25) are ADOPTED IN FULL;
3 2. Plaintiffs’ action is DISMISSED with prejudice; and 4 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to
CLOSE this case. 5 || DATED: June 17, 2025. 7 = | ¥ FU/ Fees

STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28