

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

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM B. PRUITT,	CASE NO. 1:07-cv-01709-AWI-SMS PC
Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING CERTAIN CLAIMS AND PARTIES, AND REFERRING MATTER TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS
v.	
CLARK, et al.,	
Defendants.	(Docs. 8 and 9)

Plaintiff William B. Pruitt, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on November 26, 2007. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On August 3, 2010, the Magistrate Judge screened Plaintiff’s [Amended Complaint](#) and issued a [Findings and Recommendations](#) recommending dismissal of certain claims and parties. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Plaintiff filed a timely [Objection](#) on August 19, 2010.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed August 3, 2010, is adopted in full;
2. This action shall proceed on Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, filed January 15, 2010, against Defendants Swimford, Bonilla, Laura, Curtiss, and Wan for violation of the

///

1 Fourth Amendment arising out of the routine cross-gender strip searches occurring
2 in work change;

3 3. Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment claim against Defendants Clark, Fisher, Watking,
4 Hall, and Burleson is dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state a claim;

5 4. Plaintiff's First Amendment claims and Fourteenth Amendment due process claims
6 are dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state a claim;

7 5. Defendants Clark, Fisher, Watking, Hall, and Burleson are dismissed from this action
8 based on Plaintiff's failure to state any claims against them; and

9 6. This matter is referred back to the Magistrate Judge for initiation of service of
10 process.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: September 2, 2010

14 
15 _____
16 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28