

1
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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CARL ETHRIDGE,) Case No.: 1:12-cv-02088-AWI-SAB (PC)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
) RECOMMENDATION, DISMISSING
) UNIDENTIFIED DOE DEFENDANTS FROM THE
) ACTION FOR FAILURE TO STATE A
JOHN DOE, et al.,) COGNIZABLE CLAIM FOR RELIEF
)
Defendants.) [ECF No. 17]
)
)

Plaintiff Carl Ethrdige is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On December 16, 2013, the Court screening Plaintiff’s original complaint filed on December 28, 2012, and found that Plaintiff stated a cognizable retaliation claim against Defendants F.A. Rodriguez, Reyna, C. Rasey, and V. Lawrence. However, Plaintiff did not state a cognizable retaliation claim against any of the additional unidentified Doe defendants and Plaintiff was granted the option of either filing an amended complaint or notifying the Court of his intent to proceed against the above-named defendants only.

On March 12, 2014, Plaintiff notified the Court of his intent to proceed on the retaliation against Defendants Rodriguez, Reyna, Rasey, and Lawrence only. (ECF No. 16.) Accordingly, as advised in the Court’s December 16, 2013, screening order, Plaintiff fails to state a claim against the any of the unidentified “Doe” defendants, and Findings and Recommendations to dismiss those “Doe”

1 defendants was issued on March 13, 2014. The Findings and Recommendation was served on
2 Plaintiff and contained notice that Objections to the Findings and Recommendation were to be filed
3 within fifteen days. No Objections were filed.

4 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a *de*
5 *novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings and
6 Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 8 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed on March 13, 2014, is adopted in full; and
- 9 2. This action shall proceed on Plaintiff's retaliation claim against Defendants F.A.
10 Rodriguez, Reyna, C. Rasey, and V. Lawrence;
- 11 3. All unidentified "Doe" defendants are DISMISSED from the action for failure to state a
12 cognizable claim for relief;
- 13 4. The matter is referred back to the Magistrate Judge for initiation of service of process.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: April 18, 2014

17 
18 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE