

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Harley v. County of Contra Costa

Harley · No. 2:24-cv-3059-TLN-JDP · Decided March 31, 2025

OPINION

(PS) Harley v. County of Contra Costa

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 RAOUL E HARLEY JR., Case No. 2:24-cv-3059-TLN-JDP 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER

14 COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA,

15 Defendant. 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. Plaintiff Raoul E Harley Jr. 20
("Plaintiff") filed objections on 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 filed February 11, 2025 (ECF No. 6) are 1 |
adopted; 2 2. Plaintiffs first amended complaint (ECF No. 4) is DISMISSED without leave to 3 |
amend for lack of jurisdiction; 4 3. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended complaint (ECF
No. 7) is DENIED; and 5 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case. 6 IT IS SO
ORDERED. 7 | Date: March 28, 2025 8 9 10

11 TROY L. NUNLEY

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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