1		
2		
3		
<u>4</u>		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	EFRAIN SALAZAR,	CASE NO. 1:14-cv-00211-AWI-MJS (PC)
11	Plaintiff,	
12	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
13	DR. KOKOR, et al.,	CERTAIN CLAIMS
14	Defendants.	(ECF No. 47)
15		
16		
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil	
18	rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United	
19 20	States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On September 21, 2015, the Magistrate Judge screened Plaintiff's third amended	
21 22	complaint and concluded that it states a cognizable Eighth Amendment claim against Dr.	
22 23	Winfred Kokor. (ECF No. 19.) The remaining claims and defendants were dismissed with	
23 24	prejudice for failure to state a claim. The matter since has proceeded through discovery	
2 <del>-</del> 25	and summary judgment before the undersigned. It presently is set for a settlement	
23 26	conference on January 11, 2018, and trial on June 5, 2018. (ECF Nos. 44, 45.)	
27	On December 4, 2017, the Magistrate Judge re-screened Plaintiff's third amended complaint, recognizing that a recent Ninth Circuit opinion, <u>Williams v. King</u> , 875 F.3d 500	
	Complaint, recognizing that a recent Nint	1 Oncore opinion, <u>williams v. King</u> , 075 F.30 300

1	(9th Cir. 2017), held that a magistrate judge does not have jurisdiction to dismiss claims
2	with prejudice in screening prisoner complaints absent the consent of all parties, even if
3	the plaintiff has consented to magistrate judge jurisdiction, as plaintiff had here. (Doc.
4	No. 47.) Concurrently, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations
5	recommending that the undersigned dismiss the non-cognizable claims. (Id.) Plaintiff
6	was given fourteen days to file his objections to those findings and recommendations.
7	Plaintiff did not file any objections, and the time in which to do so has now passed.
8	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304,
9	the Court has conducted a de novo review of Plaintiff's case. The Court finds the findings

10 and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

- 11 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:
  - 1. The findings and recommendations issued December 4, 2017 are adopted in full;
  - 2. The action shall continue to proceed only on Plaintiff's cognizable Eighth Amendment claim against Defendant Kokor; and
  - 3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: January 10, 2018

hlii

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE