

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
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KEVIN WILLIAM KING,

Plaintiff,

v.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 15-07072 SVW (AFM)

**ORDER ACCEPTING IN PART
FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED
STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Amended Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge. Further, the Court has engaged in a *de novo* review of those portions of the Amended Report to which Plaintiff has objected. Petitioner's Objections are overruled, except as set forth below. The Court accepts, in part, the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge.


IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that

- (1) the Amended Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is accepted and adopted in part;
- (2) defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Complaint is granted;

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

- (3) plaintiff's claims one through six are dismissed with leave to amend for failure to state a claim and failure to comply with Rule 8;
- (4) plaintiff's claims for declaratory and injunctive relieve are dismissed without further leave to amend and with prejudice;
- (5) based on the facts alleged in plaintiff's declaration submitted with his Objections and the mailing address provided by plaintiff to the Court on November 7, 2016, failure to prosecute is not a ground for dismissal of plaintiff's claims at this time; and
- (6) plaintiff, if he chooses to proceed with this action, shall file a Third Amended Complaint no later than thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

DATED: November 22, 2016



STEPHEN V. WILSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE