

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

Michael Laurence Hoke v. M. Nunez, et al.

Hoke v. Nunez · No. 2:25-cv-0275-WBS-JDP (P) · Decided August 5, 2025

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 MICHAEL LAURENCE HOKE, Case No. 2:25-cv-0275-WBS-JDP (P) 12
Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 M. NUNEZ, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner
proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief 18 under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 19 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)
(B) and Local Rule 302. 20 On July 7, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and
recommendations herein which 21 were served on plaintiff, and which contained notice to
plaintiff that any objections to the 22 findings and recommendations were to be filed within
fourteen days.

Plaintiff has not filed 23 objections to the findings and recommendations. 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.
This action is DISMISSED for failure to prosecute, failure to comply with court 4 orders, and
failure to state a claim for the reasons set forth in the April 16, 2025 order; 5 and 6 2.

The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case. 7 || Dated: August 4, 2025 8 oh hha VA, hh.b~E—
9 WILLIAM B. SHUBB UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28