



(PC) Charles Davis v. Hanford Police Department et al

2020 | Cited 0 times | E.D. California | March 16, 2020

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES DAVIS,

Plaintiff, v. HANFORD POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:19-cv-01204-DAD-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING CASE (Doc. No. 9, 10)

Plaintiff Charles Davis is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On February 11, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that this action be dismissed due to p claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with a court order. (Doc. No. 9.) The findings

and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within twenty-one (21) days of service of the order. (Id.) On February 14, 2020, plaintiff filed a document that the court construes as objections to the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 10.) In thos id.), even though the magistrate judge has already informed him

twice that his complaint does not state any cognizable claims. (See Doc. Nos. 7, 9.) In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including , the court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Accordingly:

1. The findings and recommendations issued on February 11, 2020 (Doc. No. 9), are

adopted; 2. This action is dismissed due to p ; and 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: March 13, 2020 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

