

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

8 DANIEL G. VALENCIA,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 WINFRED KOKOR, et al.,

12 Defendants.
13

Case No. 1:13-cv-01391-LJO-MJS (PC)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
REQUEST FOR SCREENING**

(ECF No. 107)

14 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil
15 rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On October 5, 2015, the Court screened
16 Plaintiff's second amended complaint and determined that it stated cognizable Eighth
17 Amendment claims for inadequate medical care against Defendants Sunduram and
18 Kokor. (ECF No. 55.) Plaintiff was given the option to proceed only on these claims or to
19 amend again. Plaintiff chose to proceed. (ECF No. 57.) His non-cognizable claims were
20 dismissed. (ECF No. 61.)

21 Defendant Kokor answered the second amended complaint. (ECF No. 70.)
22 Defendant Sunduram filed a motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 71.) As to the motion to
23 dismiss, the Court concluded that the claims as pled were cognizable, but surmised that
24 Plaintiff could nonetheless allege additional facts in support of his claims. (See ECF
25 Nos. 88, 94.) Accordingly, Defendant Sunduram's motion to dismiss was granted, the
26 complaint was dismissed in its entirety, and Plaintiff again was given leave to amend.

27 (Id.)
28

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

Plaintiff filed his third amended complaint on October 18, 2016. Defendants request that the Court screen Plaintiff's complaint in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

Defendants' request is HEREBY GRANTED. The Court will screen Plaintiff's complaint in due course. Defendants shall respond to Plaintiff's amended complaint within thirty days of the order adopting the Court's screening order, if any claims are found to be cognizable.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 28, 2016

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE