

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Joseph Perez v. County of San Joaquin, et al.

Perez · No. 2:24-cv-03402-TLN-JDP · Decided December 30, 2025

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 JOSEPH PEREZ, Case No. 2:24-cv-03402-TLN-JDP 12 Plaintiff, 13 v.
ORDER 14 COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 This matter was referred
to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 18 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On November 19, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings 19 and recommendations herein which
were served on the parties and which contained notice that 20 any objections to the findings and
recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. No 21 objections were filed. 22 The Court
presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 23 F.2d 207, 208
(9th Cir.

1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 24 See *Robbins v. Carey*,
481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the 25 magistrate judge are
reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court...”). 26 Having reviewed the
file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by 27 the record and by the
proper analysis.

28 1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 2 1. The proposed Findings and
Recommendations filed November 19, 2025, are 3 ADOPTED. 4 2. This action is DISMISSED
for failure to prosecute, failure to comply with the Court’s 5 local rules, and failure to comply with
court orders. 6 3.

The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case. 7 IT IS SO ORDERED. 8 || Date: December 29,
2025 Lah tly 10 TROY L. NUNLEY 1 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 12 13 14 15
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28