1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	WILLIAM CLIFTON,	No. 1:13-cv-1325-DAD-DLB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER GRANTING FINDINGS AND
14	JEAN PEIRRE, et al.,	RECOMMENDATION AND GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
15	Defendants.	STATE LAW CLAIMS
16		(Doc. Nos. 25 and 33)
17		
18	Plaintiff William Clifton is a prisoner in the custody of the California Department of	
19	Corrections and Rehabilitation proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis on his third amended	
20	complaint in this civil rights action. (Doc. Nos. 4 and 17.) In his complaint plaintiff alleges four	
21	causes of action: (1) violation of the Eighth Amendment brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against	
22	defendant Talley; (2) violation of the First Amendment also brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983	

against defendant Talley; (3) medical negligence against defendants Pierre and Talley; and (4) intentional infliction of emotional distress against defendant Talley. (Doc. No. 17.)

23

24

25

26

27

28

On September 28, 2015, defendants filed a motion to dismiss plaintiff's state law claims on the grounds that plaintiff failed to comply with the administrative claim requirement of the California Government Claims Act. (Doc. No. 25.) 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 March 21, 2016, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that defendants' motion to dismiss be granted. (Doc. No. 33.) Those findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto must be filed within thirty days. (Id.) The parties have not filed objections and the time for doing so has long since passed. 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 that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 33), filed March 21, 2016, are adopted in full; 2. Defendants' motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 25) is granted; 3. Plaintiff's state law claims are dismissed without leave to amend; and 4. Defendants shall file a response to the third amended complaint within twenty-one days of the date of service of this order. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **July 26, 2016**