

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Shannon O. Murphy Esq. Sr. dba Sheetmetal & Associates v. U.S.
Department of Veterans Affairs**

Murphy v. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs · No. 2:25-cv-1887-TLN-CSK · Decided October 27, 2025

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 SHANNON O. MURPHY ESQ. SR. DBA SHEETMETAL &
ASSOCIATES, 12 No. 2:25-cv-1887-TLN-CSK Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 ORDER U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF VETERANS 15 AFFAIRS, 16 Defendant. 17 18 On September 16, 2025, the magistrate judge
filed findings and recommendations (ECF 19 No. 3), which were served on the parties and which
contained notice that any objections to the 20 findings and recommendations were to be filed
within fourteen (14) days.

(ECF No. 3). No 21 objections were filed and the time to do so has passed. 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 findings and recommendations, (ECF No. 3), are ADOPTED IN FULL; and 3 2. Plaintiff’s
motion to proceed in forma pauperis, (ECF No. 2), is DENIED; 4 3. Plaintiff’s Complaint, (ECF
No. 1), is DISMISSED without leave to amend; and 5 4.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to CLOSE this case. 6 | Date: October 24, 2025 8 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