

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  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

GARRICK HARRINGTON, ) Case No.: 1:10-cv-01802-LJO-SAB (PC)  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. ) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
) RECOMMENDATION, DISMISSING CERTAIN  
14 J. BAUTISTA, et al., ) CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS FOR FAILURE TO  
) STATE A COGNIZABLE CLAIM FOR RELIEF  
)  
Defendants. ) [ECF Nos. 21, 27]  
)  
)  
)

Plaintiff Garrick Harrington is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis 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 January 7, 2014, the Magistrate Judge screening Plaintiff's first amended complaint and found that Plaintiff stated a cognizable claim against Defendants Bautista and Blaylock for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's safety in violation of the Eighth Amendment. However, Plaintiff did not state any other cognizable claims for relief against any other defendants. Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the action proceed against Defendants Bautista and Blaylock only and all other claims and defendants be dismissed from the action. The Findings and Recommendation was served on Plaintiff and contained notice that Objections were to be filed within fourteen days. After receiving an extension of time, Plaintiff filed an Objection on March 12, 2014.

///

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a *de*  
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 Findings and Recommendations, filed on January 7, 2014, is adopted in full; and
- 6 2. This action shall proceed against Defendants Bautista and Blaylock for deliberate  
7 indifference to Plaintiff's safety in violation of the Eighth Amendment; and
- 8 3. All other claims and Defendants Rupp, Hackworth, James and Does 1 through 6, are  
9 DISMISSED from the action for failure to state a cognizable claim.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: March 31, 2014

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill  
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE