

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

ANTHONY E. FELDER,
Plaintiff,
v.
HENSON, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-cv-01622-AWI-JLT (PC)
**ORDER SETTING RESPONSIVE
PLEADING DEADLINE**
(Doc. 41, 45, 54)
21-DAY DEADLINE

The Court has screened Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint and found¹ it to state the following cognizable claims upon which he may proceed:

- a. for violation of his rights under the Fourth Amendment against Defendants Amaro, Kuckenbaker, Kruse, Hill, Morgan, Villalba, Gibson, Dr. McLoughlin, and Dr. Narayan based on the events surrounding the forced extraction of contraband from Plaintiff’s rectal cavity;
- b. for excessive force in violation of the Eighth Amendment against Defendants Amaro, Kuckenbaker, Kruse, Hill, Morgan, Villalba, and Gibson; and
- c. for involuntary sedation in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment against Defendants Amaro, Kuckenbaker, Kruse, Hill, Morgan, Villalba,

¹ Though the order (Doc. 54) that adopted the findings and recommendation (Doc. 45) referred the action to the undersigned for service, Defendants have already been served. Thus, their responsive pleading is now due.

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

Gibson, Dr. McLoughlin, and Dr. Narayan.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that, within 21 days of the date of service of this order, Defendants shall file an answer ²to the Second Amended Complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 17, 2016

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

² The Second Amended Complaint was screened at Defendants’ request (*see* Doc. 42) and though Defendants had opportunity to file objections to the Findings and Recommendations thereon (*see* Doc. 45) they did not do so. Thus, the Court will not entertain any motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.