

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
78 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
910 DANIEL ROWE, CASE NO. 1:07-cv-01150-OWW-GSA PC
11 Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO PROCEED,
12 v. DISMISSING CERTAIN CLAIMS AND
13 Defendants. DEFENDANTS, AND REFERRING MATTER
M. CASTRO, et al., BACK TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR
SERVICE OF PROCESS PROCEEDINGS
14 (Docs. 11 and 12)15 Plaintiff Daniel Rowe (“Plaintiff”), a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis,
16 filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on August 8, 2007. On April 29, 2008, the
17 Court dismissed Plaintiff’s complaint, with leave to amend, for failure to state a claim. 28 U.S.C.
18 § 1915A. Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on May 22, 2008.
1920 On January 27, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued an order finding that the amended
21 complaint states a claim against Defendants Castro and Frescura for retaliating against Plaintiff, in
22 violation of the First Amendment, but does not state cognizable claims arising from the reading of
23 Plaintiff’s legal mail, from the deprivation of Plaintiff’s property, or from Defendants Maldonado,
24 Salinas, and Grannis’s responses to Plaintiff’s administrative grievances. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
25 Plaintiff was given the option of either filing a second amended complaint curing the deficiencies
26 in his claims or notifying the Court of his willingness to proceed only on his cognizable retaliation
27 claim. On February 9, 2009, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting to proceed only on his cognizable
28 claim.

1 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. Plaintiff's motion to proceed is GRANTED;

3 2. This action for damages shall proceed on Plaintiff's amended complaint, filed May

4 22, 2008, against Defendants Castro and Frescura for retaliation;

5 3. Plaintiff's First Amendment claim arising from the reading of Plaintiff's legal mail

6 is dismissed for failure to state a claim under section 1983;

7 4. Plaintiff's due process claim arising from the deprivation of his property is dismissed

8 for failure to state a claim under section 1983;

9 5. Plaintiff's claim against Defendants Maldonado, Salinas, and Grannis based on their

10 responses to his administrative grievances is dismissed for failure to state a claim

11 under section 1983; and

12 6. Defendants Rodriguez, Maldonado, Salinas, and Grannis are dismissed from this

13 action based on Plaintiff's failure to state any claims upon which relief may be

14 granted against them under section 1983; and

15 7. This matter is referred back to the Magistrate Judge to initiate service of process

16 proceedings.

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: February 13, 2009

20 /s/ Oliver W. Wanger
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE