1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	LUMPKIN WILLIAMS, NO. 1:06-cv-01569 AWI YNP GSA (PC)
10	Plaintiff, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
11	V. GARZA, et al.,
12	UARZA, et al.,
13	Defendants.
14	
15	/
16	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action
17	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On September 22, 2009, the Court issued an order finding that
18	Plaintiff's second amended complaint states cognizable claims against certain defendants, but does
19	not state a cognizable against Defendants Trimble, Myers and Fresno County Sheriff's Investigative
20	Division. Plaintiff also failed to state a claim on his allegations regarding medical care and failure
21	to report. The Court ordered Plaintiff to either file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his
22	willingness to proceed only on the claims found to be cognizable. On October 13, 2009, Plaintiff
23	notified the Court that he does not wish to amend and is willing to proceed on the claims found
24	cognizable. Based on Plaintiff's notice, this Findings and Recommendations now issues. See Noll
25	v. Carlson, 809 F. 2d 1446, 1448 (9th Cir. 1987) (prisoner must be given notice of deficiencies and
26	opportunity to amend prior to dismissing for failure to state a claim).
27	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that Defendants Trimble, Myers, and

28

and Fresno County Sheriff's Investigative Divsion, be dismissed. IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that Plaintiff's claims regarding medical care and failure to report be dismissed.

These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within **thirty (30) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. <u>Martinez v. Ylst</u>, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>October 21, 2009</u>

/s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE