## 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

KELVIN FELTON,

VS.

J. LOPEZ, et al.,

Plaintiff.

Defendants.

1

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1:12-cv-01066-AWI-GSA-PC

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Doc. 61.)

ORDER GRANTING IN PART DEFENDANT LOPEZ'S MOTION TO DISMISS SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM, OR BASED ON QUALIFIED IMMUNITY, WITH LEAVE TO AMEND (Doc. 38.)

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT LOPEZ'S MOTION TO STRIKE EXHIBITS FROM ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

ORDER FOR CLERK TO FILE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT LODGED ON FEBRUARY 17, 2015 (Doc. 65.)

ORDER FOR DEFENDANTS LOPEZ AND HARRISON TO FILE ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT WITHIN THIRTY DAYS

Kelvin Felton ("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 January 28, 2015, findings and recommendations were entered, recommending that Defendant Lopez's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's Supplemental Complaint for failure to state a claim, or based on qualified immunity, be granted in part with leave to amend; and that

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	
2	5	

defendant Lopez's motion to strike be denied. (Doc. 61.) The parties were granted an opportunity to file objections to the findings and recommendations within thirty days. To date, no objections have been filed. However, on February 17, 2015, Plaintiff lodged a proposed First Amended Complaint. (Doc. 65.)

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 January 28, 2015, are ADOPTED IN FULL;
- 2. Defendant Lopez's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's Supplemental Complaint for failure to state a claim, or based on qualified immunity, filed on May 2, 2014, is GRANTED IN PART, with leave to file a First Amended Complaint combining the claims in the original Complaint and the Supplemental Complaint;
- 3. Defendant Lopez's motion to strike exhibits from the original Complaint, filed on May 2, 2014, is DENIED;
- 4. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to file the First Amended Complaint lodged on February 17, 2015 (Doc. No. 65);
- 5. Defendants Harrison and Lopez shall file an Answer to the First Amended Complaint within thirty days from the date of service of this order; and

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>March 5, 2015</u>

27

26

28