///

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOUIS OLIVEREZ, JR.,	CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00352-LJO-SKO PC	
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY	
BEN ALBITRE, et al., Defendants.	JUDGMENT, AND REQUIRING PARTIES TO FILE STATUS REPORTS WITHIN THIRTY DAYS REGARDING SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE	

Plaintiff Louis Oliverez, Jr. is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action for damages is proceeding on Plaintiff's amended complaint, filed on May 7, 2009, against Defendants Albitre and Adams for violation of the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

(Docs. 36 and 49)

This 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 31, 2012, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations herein which was served on the parties and which contained notice to the parties that any objections to the Findings and Recommendations were to be filed within fifteen days. The parties have not filed timely objections to the Findings and Recommendations.

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.

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
2	1.	The Findings and Recommendations, filed on August 31, 2012, is adopted in full;
3	2.	Defendant Adams' motion for summary judgment is GRANTED as to Plaintiff's free
4		exercise claim against;
5	3.	Defendant Albitre's motion for summary judgment as to Plaintiff's free exercise
6		claim against him is DENIED and Defendant Albitre's motion for summary
7		judgment on the ground of qualified immunity is DENIED;
8	4.	The parties are ordered to file status reports within thirty (30) days from the date of
9		service of this order regarding their position on having a settlement conference prior
10		to the expenditure of any resources on trial preparation; and
11	5.	This matter is referred back to the Magistrate Judge to set a trial date.
12		
13		
14	IT IS SO	ORDERED.
15	Dated:	September 24, 2012/s/ Lawrence J. O'NeillUNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		