1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8	CHARLES STEWART,	CASE NO. 1:10-cv-00985-AWI-SKO PC	
9	Plaintiff,	ORDER (1) ADOPTING FINDINGS AND	
10	V.	RECOMMENDATIONS, (2) DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF	
11	J. TILTON, et al.,	COUNSEL, (3) DISMISSING ACTION WITH PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO STATE A	
12	Defendants.	CLAIM UNDER SECTION 1983 AGAINST DEFENDANTS TILTON, SULLIVAN, AND	
13		ALLISION, AND (4) DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO ENTER JUDGMENT	
14		(Docs. 17, 18, 19, and 20)	
15 16		ORDER COUNTING DISMISSAL AS A STRIKE UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1915(G)	
17			
18	Plaintiff Charles Stewart, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this		
19	civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on June 3, 2010. The matter was referred to a United		
20	States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.		
21	On October 17, 2011, a Findings and Recommendations was filed in which the Magistrate		
22	Judge screened Plaintiff's amended complaints and recommended dismissal of the action for failure		
23	to state a claim. <sup>1</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The thirty-day objection period has expired and Plaintiff did		
24	not file an objection.		
25	///		
26			
27	<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff filed three documents on Augu	st 3, 2011, August 15, 2011, and August 22, 2011. In light of	

Plaintiff's pro se status and the contents of Hugust 9, 2011, Hugust 19, 2011, and Hugust 22, 2011. In light 01
Plaintiff's pro se status and the contents of the filings, the Magistrate Judge found that it was in the interest of justice to make an exception and view the filings of August 3 and August 22 together as the amended complaint, with the filing of August 15 treated as a motion seeking the appointment of counsel.

1	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a <i>de</i>		
2	novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings and		
3	Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.		
4	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:		
5	1.	The Court adopts the Findings and Recommendations filed on October 17, 2011, in	
6		full;	
7	2.	Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is denied;	
8	3.	This action is dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state a claim under section	
9		1983 against Defendants Tilton, Sullivan, and Allison;	
10	4.	The Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment against Plaintiff; and	
11	5.	This dismissal counts as a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).	
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
13	Dated: December 23, 2011		
14		CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
15			
16 17			
17 18			
19 20			
20 21			
21			
22			
23			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		2	