

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL GONZALES,

 Plaintiff,

 vs.

PRICE, et al.,

1:07-cv-01391-AWI-SMS-PC

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS
(Doc. 12)

ORDER FOR THIS ACTION TO PROCEED
ONLY AGAINST DEFENDANTS PRICE,
FRESCURA, VIKJORD, PINZON, AND
M. CASTRO, ON PLAINTIFF’S FIRST
AMENDMENT CLAIMS, AND DISMISSING
ALL OTHER CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS

_____ /

 Michael Gonzales (“plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights
action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge
pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 72-302.

 On February 18, 2010, findings and recommendations were entered, recommending
that this action proceed only against defendants Price, K. Frescura, B.S. Vikjord, M. Castro, and R.
Pinzon on plaintiff’s First Amendment claims, and all other claims and defendants be dismissed.
Plaintiff was provided an opportunity to file objections to the findings and recommendations within
thirty days. To date, plaintiff has not filed objections or otherwise responded to the findings and
recommendations.

 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73-
305, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire

1 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper
2 analysis.

3 Accordingly, THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS that:

4 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued by the Magistrate Judge on
5 February 18, 2010, are adopted in full;

6 2. This action now proceeds only against defendants Price, K. Frescura, B.S.
7 Vikjord, M. Castro, and R. Pinzon, on plaintiff's claims for retaliation and for refusal to mail his
8 correspondence, in violation of the First Amendment;

9 3. All remaining claims and defendants are dismissed from this action;

10 4. Plaintiff's claims for theft of personal property, verbal harassment, forced
11 medication, denial of showers, conspiracy, supervisory liability, and improper inmate appeals are
12 dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under section 1983;

13 5. Defendants E. Castro, J. Munoz, Warden Darrel Adams, and Kelley are
14 dismissed from this action based on Plaintiff's failure to state any claims upon which relief may be
15 granted against them; and

16 6. The Clerk is directed to reflect the dismissal of defendants E. Castro, J.
17 Munoz, Warden Darrel Adams, and Kelley from this action on the court's docket.

18

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 **Dated:** April 5, 2010

/s/ Anthony W. Ishii
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28