

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Terrence Brewer v. California State Bar, et al.

Case No. 2:23-cv-0860-TLN-JDP · No. 2:23-cv-0860-TLN-JDP · Decided March 11, 2025

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 TERRENCE BREWER, Case No. 2:23-cv-0860-TLN-JDP 12 Plaintiff, 13
v. ORDER 14 CALIFORNIA STATE BAR, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 On February 12, 2025,
the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein 18 which were served on the
parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings 19 and recommendations
were to be filed within fourteen days.

Plaintiff filed objections on 20 February 24, 2025, and they were considered by the undersigned.
21 The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 22
F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979).

The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 23 See *Robbins v. Carey*, 481
F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the 24 magistrate judge are reviewed
de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court....”). 25 Having reviewed the file, the
court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by 26 the record and by the proper
analysis.

27 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 28 1. The proposed Findings and
Recommendations (ECF No. 48) filed February 12, 2025, 1 | are adopted; 2 2. Plaintiffs motion
for injunctive relief (ECF No. 43) is DENIED without prejudice to 3 | renewal; and 4 3. This
matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for all further pretrial 5 | matters. 6 IT IS
SO ORDERED.

7 || Date: March 10, 2025 8 10 TROY L. NUNLEY 11 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT
JUDGE 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28