1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	WILLIAM H. COLLIER, JR.,	CASE NO. 1:11-cv-00270-LJO-GBC (PC)
10	Plaintiff,	ODDED ADODTINIC EINIDINICS AND
11	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
12	J. DREHER, et al.,	(Doc. 15)
13	Defendants.	
14		/
15		
16	I. Procedural Background	
17	Plaintiff William H. Collier, Jr. is a fe	ederal prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis
18	in this civil action pursuant to Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics,	
19	403 U.S. 388 (1971), which provides a remedy for violation of civil rights by federal actors.	
20	Plaintiff filed the complaint on February 14, 2011. Doc. 1. The matter was referred to a United	
21	States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 26,	
22	2012, the Magistrate Judge screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C.	
23	§ 1915A, and found that stated a cognizable Due Process claim and access to courts claim against	
24	Defendant J. Dreher stemming from intentionally falsifying a document relied upon in determining	
25	the length of Plaintiff's prison sentence and preventing Plaintiff to mail an objection in another	
26	action which led to the action being dismissed. Doc. 13.	
27	The Magistrate Judge ordered Plaint	iff to either address the shortcomings of the complaint
28	through amendment or to notify the Court of	f his willingness to proceed on the cognizable claims.

1

1	Doc. 13. On November 26, 2012, Plaintiff stated that he did not wish to file an amended complaint	
2	and gave notice of his willingness to proceed on the cognizable claims against Defendant J. Dreher.	
3	Doc. 14. On November 28, 2012, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations	
4	herein where the Magistrate Judge recommended that the action proceed against Defendant J. Dreher	
5	on Due Process claim and access to courts claims and that all remaining claims and Defendants: 1)	
6	H.S. Rios, Jr. (Warden at USPA); 2) Regional Director; 3) Paul R. A. Howard (Parole Commission);	
7	and 4) General Counsel, be dismissed from this action. Doc. 15. Plaintiff has not filed any	
8	objections.	
9	II. Conclusion and Order	
10	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a	
11	de novo review of this case. The Court concludes that the Findings and Recommendations are	
12	supported by the record and by proper analysis.	
13	Based on the foregoing, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that:	
14	1. This action proceed against Defendant J. Dreher on Due Process claim and access	
15	to courts claims; and	
16	2. All remaining claims and Defendants: 1) H.S. Rios, Jr. (Warden at USPA); 2)	
17	Regional Director; 3) Paul R. A. Howard (Parole Commission); and 4) General	
18	Counsel, are dismissed from this action.	
19	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
20	Dated: December 18, 2012 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	