1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 TAYLOR GUNDY, CASE No. 1:12-cv-01020-LJO-MJS (PC) 11 ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND Plaintiff, RECOMMENDATIONS THAT 12 DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR PARTIAL DISMISSAL BE GRANTED ٧. 13 14 (ECF No. 34) CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF 15 CORRECTIONS & REHABILITATION, et CASE TO REMAIN OPEN al., 16 17 Defendants. 18 19 20 21 Plaintiff Taylor Gundy, a former state prisoner, initiated this action on June 21, 22 2012 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1983. (Compl., ECF No. 1.) The matter was referred 23 to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 24 302 of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. 25 26 27 -1-

On February 11, 2013, Findings and Recommendations were filed in which the Magistrate Judge recommended that the motion for partial dismissal brought by Defendants CDCR and Lopez (ECF No. 15) and the motion for partial dismissal brought by Defendants Arambula and Horton (ECF No.27) be granted such that Defendant CDCR be dismissed from this action and the state law claims asserted against Defendants Lopez, Arambula and Horton in the First Amended Complaint be dismissed without prejudice. (F & R Granting Defendants' Motions for Partial Dismissal, ECF No. 34.)

The parties were notified that objection, if any, was due within fourteen days after service. No party filed an objection to the Findings and Recommendations.

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, the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- The Court adopts the Findings and Recommendations filed February 11,
 2013, in full;
- 2. The motion for partial dismissal brought by Defendants CDCR and Lopez (ECF No. 15) and the motion for partial dismissal brought by Defendants Arambula and Horton (ECF No.27) ARE GRANTED such that Defendant CDCR is DISMISSED from this action and the state law claims asserted against Defendants Lopez, Arambula and Horton in the First Amended Complaint ARE DISMISSED without prejudice;

- 3. Plaintiff may proceed on his Eighth Amendment claim against Defendants Lopez, Horton, Arambula, Paik and DOES 1-50, against Defendants Paik and Pacific Orthopedic on his state law medical malpractice claim, and against Defendants Paik and DOES 1-50 on his state law failure to summon medical care claim; and
- 4. The Clerk is directed this case shall remain open.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 1, 2013 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE