1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	BRIAN ESPRITT,	1:11-cv-00519-AWI-GSA-PC
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
13	VS.	(Doc. 67.)
14	A. SAESEE, et al.,	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
15	Defendants.	(Doc. 56.)
16 17		ORDER FOR DEFENDANTS TO FILE MOTION OR ANSWER WITHIN THIRTY DAYS
18		

Brian Espritt ("Plaintiff") 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 September 15, 2014, <u>findings and recommendations</u> were entered, recommending that Defendants' motion to dismiss be denied. (Doc. 67.) The parties were granted thirty days in which to file objections to the findings and recommendations. To date, 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 <u>de novo</u> 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:

- 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued by the Magistrate Judge on September 15, 2014, are ADOPTED IN FULL; and
- 2. Defendants' motion to dismiss, filed on May 7, 2014, is DENIED;
- 3. Within thirty days from the date of service of this order, Defendants shall either file an answer to the Second Amended Complaint, or file a motion for summary judgment pursuant to <u>Albino v. Baca</u>;¹ and

4. This case is referred back to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Alii

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: <u>November 15, 2014</u>

¹ In <u>Albino v. Baca</u>, the Ninth Circuit held that a motion for summary judgment is the appropriate procedural device for pretrial determination of whether administrative remedies have been exhausted under the PLRA. <u>Albino v. Baca</u>, 747 F.3d 1162, 1170 (9th Cir. 2014).