

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 LEONARD RANSOM, JR.,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 DANNY HERRERA, et al.,

11 Defendants.

1:11-cv-01709-LJO-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS
(ECF NOS. 72 & 76)

ORDER FOR THIS ACTION TO
PROCEED AGAINST DEFENDANTS
BRANNUM AND HERRERA ON
PLAINTIFF'S FOURTEENTH
AMENDMENT PROCEDURAL DUE
PROCESS CLAIM, FOURTEENTH
AMENDMENT SUBSTANTIVE DUE
PROCESS CLAIM UNDER DEVEREAUX,
RETALIATION CLAIM, SECTION 1983
MALICIOUS PROSECUTION CLAIM,
AND CONSPIRACY CLAIM, AND
DISMISSING ALL OTHER CLAIMS AND
DEFENDANTS

12
13
14
15
16
17 Leonard Ransom, Jr. ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights
18 action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case now proceeds on Plaintiff's Second
19 Amended Complaint, which was filed on May 15, 2017. (ECF No. 72). The matter was
20 referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local
21 Rule 302.

22 On June 30, 2017, Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean entered findings and
23 recommendations, recommending that this action proceed against defendants Brannum and
24 Herrera on Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment procedural due process claim, Fourteenth
25 Amendment substantive due process claim under Devereaux, retaliation claim, section 1983
26 malicious prosecution claim, and conspiracy claim, and that all other claims and defendants be
27 dismissed with prejudice. (ECF No. 76). Both parties were provided an opportunity to file
28

1 objections to the findings and recommendations. No objections were filed.

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

6 Accordingly, THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS that:

- 7 1. The findings and recommendations issued by the Magistrate Judge on June 30,
8 2017, are ADOPTED in full;
- 9 2. This action now proceeds on Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint (ECF No.
10 72), against defendants Brannum and Herrera on Plaintiff's Fourteenth
11 Amendment procedural due process claim, Fourteenth Amendment substantive
12 due process claim under Devereaux, retaliation claim, section 1983 malicious
13 prosecution claim, and conspiracy claim;
- 14 3. All other claims and defendants are DISMISSED from this action, with
15 prejudice;
- 16 4. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to reflect the dismissal of defendant J. Castro
17 on the Court's docket; and
- 18 5. This case is referred back to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings.

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: August 1, 2017

22 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
23 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28