

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Dailey v. Ellis

No. 2:23-cv-0786 TLN CSK P · No. 2:23-cv-0786 TLN CSK P · Decided March 31, 2025

OPINION

(PC) Dailey v. Ellis

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 SHARON N. DAILEY, No. 2:23-cv-0786 TLN CSK P

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 JOHN B. ELLIS, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff Sharon N.
Dailey (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action 18 seeking relief under 42
U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate 19 Judge pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 20 On February 18, 2025, the magistrate judge filed
findings and recommendations which 21 were served on plaintiff and which contained notice that
any objections to the findings and 22 recommendations were to be filed within fourteen (14) days.
This deadline has passed, and 23 Plaintiff has not filed any objections. 24 The Court presumes that
any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 25 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979).
The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 26 See *Robbins v. Carey*, 481
F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the 27 magistrate judge are reviewed
de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court[.]”). 28 Having reviewed the file, the
Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by 1 | the record and by the proper
analysis. 2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 3 1. The findings and recommendations
(ECF No. 23) are ADOPTED in full; and 4 2. This action is DISMISSED for failure to prosecute.

5 6 Date: March 28, 2025 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