

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

MARK S. SOKOLSKY,)	1:13-cv-02044 LJO DLB PC
)	
Plaintiff,)	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
)	REGARDING PLAINTIFF’S NOTICE OF
vs.)	WILLINGNESS TO PROCEED ON
)	COGNIZABLE CLAIMS
)	
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,)	[ECF No. 15]
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff Mark S. Sokolsky (“Plaintiff”) is a civil detainee proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action. Plaintiff filed this action on December 16, 2013.

On September 11, 2015, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint (“FAC”). He named the State of California, Christine Mativo, Rebecca Domrese, Audrey King, Alan Carlson, Brian Bowley, Marisa Bigot, Kamala Harris, and John/Jane Does 1 to 100 as Defendants. On July 27, 2015, the Court screened Plaintiff’s FAC and found that it stated the following claims: (1) violation of Plaintiff’s First Amendment rights to free exercise of religion by Defendants Mativo, Domrese, King, Bowley, and Bigot; (2) violation of RLUIPA by Defendants Mativo, Domrese, King, Bowley, and Bigot; and (3) violation of Plaintiff’s substantive due process rights by Defendants King, Mativo, and Domrese for conditions of confinement. The Court ordered

1 Plaintiff to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his willingness to proceed only on
2 these claims.

3 On August 10, 2015, Plaintiff notified the Court that he wanted to proceed only on the
4 cognizable claims identified above.¹

5 **RECOMMENDATION**

6 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY RECOMMENDS the following:

7 1. This action be ORDERED to proceed on the following claims: (1) violation of
8 Plaintiff's First Amendment rights to free exercise of religion by Defendants Mativo, Domrese,
9 King, Bowley, and Bigot; (2) violation of RLUIPA by Defendants Mativo, Domrese, King,
10 Bowley, and Bigot; and (3) violation of Plaintiff's substantive due process rights by Defendants
11 King, Mativo, and Domrese for conditions of confinement; and

12 2. The remaining claims, as well as Defendants State of California, Alan Carlson, and
13 Kamala Harris, be DISMISSED from this action.

14 These Findings and Recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
15 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen
16 (14) days after date of service of these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may file written
17 objections with the Court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate
18 Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections
19 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v.
20 Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
21

22
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: August 18, 2015

25 /s/ Dennis L. Beck
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27 ¹ Plaintiff also submitted an unsolicited brief concerning the law applicable to his case. The Court will not address
28 Plaintiff's various arguments since Plaintiff's arguments are not relevant to any issue at this time, and because the
Court is well aware of the law applicable in this case.