

VS.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEONARD RANSOM, JR., | 1:10-cv-00397-AWI-EPG-PC

Plaintiff,

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (ECF No. 124.)

R. MARQUEZ, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT SANDOVAL'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

(ECF No. 110.)

ORDER ENTERING SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT SANDOVAL

ORDER FOR THIS CASE TO PROCEED AGAINST DEFENDANTS AMADOR, NAVA, MARQUEZ, AND NUNEZ FOR USE OF EXCESSIVE FORCE; AND AGAINST DEFENDANTS NAVA, MARQUEZ, AND YBARRA FOR FAILURE TO PROTECT PLAINTIFF

Leonard Ransom ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with 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 December 2, 2015, findings and recommendations were entered, recommending that defendant Sandoval's motion for summary judgment be granted. (ECF No. 110.) The parties

were granted twenty days in which to file objections to the findings and recommendations. (<u>Id.</u>) The twenty-day deadline has passed, and no objections have been filed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this 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 proper analysis.

Accordingly, THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS that:

- The Findings and Recommendations issued by the Magistrate Judge on 1. December 2, 2015, are ADOPTED IN FULL;
- 2. Defendant Sandoval's motion for summary judgment, filed on July 31, 2015, is GRANTED;
- 3. Summary judgment is entered in favor of defendant Sandoval;
- 4. This case now proceeds against defendants Amador, Nava, Marquez, and Nunez for use of excessive force; and against defendants Nava, Marquez, and Ybarra for failure to protect Plaintiff;
- The Clerk is directed to reflect on the Court's docket that the claims against 5. defendant Sandoval are resolved; and
- 6. This case is referred back to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>January 25, 2016</u> SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

28