

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

Christopher Brick v. Jennifer Cretchen-McCoy, et al.

No. 2:23-cv-02621-TLN-JDP, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (February 20,
2025)

OPINION

(PS) Brick v. Cretchen-McCoy

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 CHRISTOPHER BRICK, Case No. 2:23-cv-02621-TLN-JDP 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14
JENNIFER CRETCHEN-MCCOY, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 On January 17, 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 January 17, 2025 (ECF No. 5) are
28 1 ADOPTED; 2 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute, failure to
comply 3 with court orders, and failure to state a claim for the reasons set forth in the court’s
4 November 8, 2024 order. (See ECF No. 3)

5 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case. 6 IT IS SO ORDERED. 7 Date: February 20,
2025 8 Lally 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