1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ANDREW R. LOPEZ,	1:08-cv-01975 LJO JLT (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
13	v.	
14	FLOREZ, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	(ECF Nos. 127, 148, 191)
16		
17	Disintiff Androw D. Longraio a state	misonon mesocialing mus as and in forms a narrowing
18	Plaintiff, Andrew R. Lopez, is a state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> and <i>in forma pauperis</i>	
19	with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Reed and	
20	Flores provided him with inadequate medical care in violation of the Eighth Amendment and committed medical malpractice when they delayed in distributing his post-operative pain	
21	medication. (<i>See</i> ECF No. 23.) Plaintiff and Defendants filed cross-motions for summary	
22	judgment. (ECF Nos. 127, 148.)	
23	On October 21, 2013, the Magistrate Judge issued a Findings and Recommendations to	
24	deny Defendants' motion and to grant Plaintiff's. (ECF No. 191.) This was served on both parties	
2526	and contained notice that objections to the Findings and Recommendations were to be filed	
27	within fourteen days. (<i>Id.</i>) Defendants filed objections on November 4, 2013 to which Plaintiff	
28	responded on November 14, 2013. (ECF Nos. 194, 195.)	
20		1

1	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this	
2	case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings and	
3	Recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.	
4	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
5	1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed on October 21, 2013 (ECF No. 191),	
6	are adopted in full;	
7	2. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, filed on February 22, 2013 (ECF No.	
8	127), is GRANTED;	
9	3. Defendants' motion for summary judgment, filed on April 4, 2013 (ECF No. 148),	
10	is DENIED;	
11	4. Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief in his motion for summary judgment is	
12	DENIED; and	
13	5. The case is referred back to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings,	
14	including a possible settlement conference and to set for trial on damages.	
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
16		
17	Dated: November 20, 2013 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	2	