complaint states cognizable claims against certain defendants, but does not state a cognizable Due

pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. November 10, 2009, the Court issued an order finding that Plaintiff's

Process claim and does not state any claims against Defendants Cate, Billings, Pfeiffer, or Grannis.

The Court ordered Plaintiff to either file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his willingness

to proceed only on the claims found to be cognizable. On December 2, 2009, Plaintiff notified the

Court that he does not wish to amend and is willing to proceed on the claims found cognizable.

Based on Plaintiff's notice, this Findings and Recommendations now issues. See Noll v. Carlson,

809 F. 2d 1446, 1448 (9th Cir. 1987) (prisoner must be given notice of deficiencies and opportunity

to amend prior to dismissing for failure to state a claim).

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Accordingly, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that Plaintiff's Due Process claim and

Defendants Cate, Billings, Pfeiffer and Grannis be dismissed.

These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge

assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within thirty (30) days after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). IT IS SO ORDERED. **Dated:** <u>December 14, 2009</u> /s/ Sandra M. Snyder UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE