1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9			
10	BARRY LAMON,	CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00157-AWI-SKO PC	
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DIRECTING ACTION TO PROCEED ON FIRST AND EIGHTH AMENDMENT	
12	V.	CLAIMS AGAINST DEFENDANTS BIRKHOLM, MAYUGBA AND SCHUTT,	
13	JOHN TILTON, et al.,	DISMISSING OTHER CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS, AND REFERRING MATTER	
14	Defendants.	BACK TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR FURTHER PROCEEDINGS	
15		(Docs. 1, 19, and 24)	
16		_/	
17	Plaintiff Barry Lamon, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this		
18	civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and California law on January 26, 2009. (Doc. 1.)		
19 20	On March 7, 2011, the Court screened Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and		
20	found that it states a First Amendment retaliation claim against Defendant Birkholm and an Eighth		
21	Amendment medical care claim against Defendants Birkholm, Mayugba, and Schutt. Fed. R. Civ.		
22	P. 8(a); <u>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</u> , 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009); <u>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</u> , 550 U.S.		
23 24	544, 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 1964-65 (2007). (Doc. 19.) However, the Court found that Plaintiff's		
24 25	other claims were not cognizable. Plaintiff was ordered to either file an amended complaint or notify		
45			

the Court of his willingness to proceed only on his cognizable claims. On April 21, 2011, Plaintiff notified the Court that he is willing to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable in the screening order. (Doc. 24.)

1	Accordingly, in light of the screening order and Plaintiff's election to proceed on his		
2	cognizable claims, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:		
3	1.	This action shall proceed on Plaintiff's complaint, filed January 26, 2009, on	
4		Plaintiff's First Amendment retaliation claim against Defendant Birkholm and	
5		Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment medical care claim against Defendants Birkholm,	
6		Mayugba, and Schutt;	
7	2.	All other defendants and claims are dismissed from this action; and	
8	3.	This matter is referred back to the Magistrate Judge to initiate the service of process	
9		phase.	
10			
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
12	Dated: June 9, 2011 Athlin		
13	2	CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			