1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ANDREW CEJAS,	No. 1:12-cv-00271 AWI DLB PC
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FILED BY DEFENDANTS MYERS, TRIMBLE, McGEE AND FISHER
13	V.	
14	MYERS, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	(Document 174)
16		
17	Plaintiff Andrew A. Cejas ("Plaintiff") is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se and	
18	in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is	
19	proceeding on Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint for violation of his First Amendment right to	
20	practice his religion against Defendants.	
21	On January 11, 2016, Defendants Myers, Trimble, McGee and Fisher filed a motion for	
22	summary judgment. The matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28	
23	U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
24	On April 20, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued Findings and Recommendations that	
25	Defendants' motion be granted. The Findings and Recommendations were served on Plaintiff	
26		
27		
28	<sup>1</sup> Defendants Foston, Van Leer and Pimentel are represummary judgment. The motion was addressed by sep	esented by different counsel and have filed their own motion for parate Findings and Recommendations.  1

and contained notice that any objections must be filed within thirty (30) days. Plaintiff filed objections on May 26, 2016. Defendants filed their reply on June 6, 2016.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff's objections and Defendants' reply, the Court finds that the Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

Plaintiff's objections are based mainly on his disagreement with the Magistrate Judge's evidentiary rulings and interpretation of the evidence. As in his opposition to the motion for summary judgment, Plaintiff's arguments remain based on speculation and/or inadmissible hearsay. In fact, the Magistrate Judge addressed many of the arguments that Plaintiff now repeats in his objections. Plaintiff also repeats his arguments related to an equal protection issue, though this claim was dismissed from this action.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed April 20, 2016, are adopted in full;
- 2. The motion for summary judgment filed by Defendants Myers, Trimble, McGee and Fisher (Document 132) is GRANTED;

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

3. Judgment is ENTERED IN FAVOR of Defendants Myers, McGee, Fisher and Trimble.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 16, 2016

27

28