

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 STEVEN VLASICH,

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13 DR. NAREDDY, et al.,

14 Defendants.
15
16
17

1:13-cv-00326-LJO-EPG-PC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS,
RECOMMENDING THAT THIS ACTION
PROCEED ONLY AGAINST DEFENDANTS
DR. BEREGOVSKAYA AND DR.
NAREDDY ON PLAINTIFF'S EIGHTH
AMENDMENT MEDICAL CLAIMS, AND
THAT ALL OTHER CLAIMS AND
DEFENDANTS BE DISMISSED

OBJECTIONS, IF ANY, DUE IN 20 DAYS

18 Steven Vlasich ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*
19 in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case now proceeds on the Second
20 Amended Complaint filed by Plaintiff on August 18, 2014. (ECF No. 17.) The Second
21 Amended Complaint names Dr. C. Nareddy, Dr. C. McCabe, Dr. J. Wong, Dr. O.
22 Beregovskaya, Dr. Williams, Nurse Kayun, and Nurse B. Morean as defendants, and alleges
23 claims for inadequate medical care under the Eighth Amendment.

24 The Court screened the Second Amended Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A
25 and found that it states cognizable medical claims under § 1983 only against Dr. C. Nareddy
26 and Dr. O. Beregovskaya. (ECF No. 18.) On September 29, 2015, Plaintiff was granted leave
27 to either file another amended complaint or notify the court that he is willing to proceed only
28 on the claims found cognizable by the Court. (*Id.*) On October 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed a

1 notice informing the Court that he is willing to proceed only against defendants Dr. C. Nareddy
2 and Dr. O. Beregovskaya on the cognizable Eighth Amendment medical claims. (ECF No. 20.)

3 Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

- 4 1. This action proceed only against defendants Dr. C. Nareddy and Dr. O.
5 Beregovskaya, on Plaintiff's claims for inadequate medical care under the
6 Eighth Amendment;
- 7 2. All remaining claims and defendants be dismissed from this action; and
- 8 3. Defendants Dr. C. McCabe, Dr. J. Wong, Dr. Williams, Nurse Kayun, and
9 Nurse B. Morean be dismissed from this action with prejudice based on
10 Plaintiff's failure to state any claims upon which relief may be granted against
11 him.

12 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District
13 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within
14 **twenty (20) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may
15 file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to
16 Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
17 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.
18 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

19
20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: October 26, 2015

23 /s/ Eric P. Gray
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
25
26
27
28