

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Christy L. Spector v. David E. Spector, et al.

Spector v. Spector · No. 2:24-cv-2170-TLN-JDP · Decided March 31, 2025

OPINION

(PS) Spector v. Spector

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 CHRISTY L. SPECTOR, Case No. 2:24-cv-2170-TLN-JDP 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14
DAVID E. SPECTOR, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 On February 11, 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. No objections were filed. 20 The Court presumes that any findings of fact
are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 21 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate
judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 22 See *Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147
(9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the 23 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 supported by 25 the record and by the proper analysis. 26
Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 27

1. The proposed Findings and Recommendations filed February 11, 2025 (ECF No. 4) are
28 1 | ADOPTED; 2 2. Plaintiffs complaint (ECF No. 1) is DISMISSED without leave to amend;
and 3 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. 4 IT IS SO ORDERED. 5 | Date: March
28, 2025 6 8

9 TROY L. NUNLEY

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28