

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DENNIS L. HAMILTON,
Plaintiff,
v.
JOHN HART et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:10-cv-00272-DAD-EPG

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. No. 75)

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

(Doc. No. 41)

ORDER FOR DEFENDANTS TO FILE
ANSWER TO COMPLAINT WITHIN
THIRTY DAYS

Plaintiff Dennis L. Hamilton is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 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 March 21, 2016, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that defendants' motion for summary judgment be denied. (Doc. No. 75.) On April 20, 2016, defendants filed objections to the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 76.) On May 5, 2016, plaintiff filed a reply. (Doc. No. 77.)


1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this
2 court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file,
3 including defendants' objections and plaintiff's reply, the court finds the findings and
4 recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

5 Accordingly,

- 6 1. The March 21, 2016 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 75) are adopted in full;
- 7 2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 41) is denied;
- 8 3. Within thirty days from the date of service of this order, defendants shall file an
9 answer to the complaint; and
- 10 4. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: August 18, 2016

13 
14 _____
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28