

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEITH DARNELL DENEGAL,
Plaintiff,
v.
P.D. BRAZELTON et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:14-cv-01410-DAD-SAB

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS, GRANTING IN
PART AND DENYING IN PART
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS

(Doc. Nos. 11, 20)

Plaintiff Keith Darnell Denegal is appearing *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The matter was referred to the assigned magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On September 22, 2015, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations recommending that defendants' motion to dismiss be granted as to defendants Knight, Lozano and Geringer and denied as to defendant Brazelton and that plaintiff's claim for injunctive relief be dismissed as moot. Those findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained a notice that objections were to be filed within thirty days. (Doc. No. 20.) Thereafter, plaintiff's motion for a thirty-day extension of time to file an objection to the findings and recommendations was granted. (Doc. No. 23.) Nonetheless, plaintiff has not

1 filed objections within the extended period of time, which has long since expired. Defendants
2 also have not filed objections.


3 In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a *de novo* review of
4 this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and
5 recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. The court's analysis with
6 respect to plaintiff's claim for injunctive relief remains unchanged by his subsequent transfer to
7 Salinas Valley State Prison (*see* Doc. No. 21).

8 Accordingly,

- 9 1. The September 22, 2015 findings and recommendations are adopted in full;
- 10 2. Defendants' motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim as to defendants Knight,
11 Lozano, and Geringer is GRANTED;
- 12 3. Defendants Knight, Lozano, and Geringer are DISMISSED from the action;
- 13 4. Defendants' motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim for relief as to defendant
14 Brazelton is DENIED; and
- 15 5. Plaintiff's claim for injunctive relief is DISMISSED as MOOT.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.
17

18
19 Dated: January 8, 2016



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE