

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

GORDON C. REID,  
  
                                  Plaintiff,  
  
          v.  
  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,  
  
                                  Defendants.

CASE No. 1: 14-cv-01163-LJO-MJS (PC)  
  
**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS TO DENY  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF  
FINAL JUDGMENT**  
  
(ECF NO. 64)

Plaintiff is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action brought pursuant to Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302 of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

On August 24, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for the entry of final judgement which seeks partial judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) as to the claims and defendants dismissed in the Court's screening order. (ECF No. 59.) On November 21, 2017, the Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations to deny Plaintiff's motion. (ECF No. 64.) Plaintiff filed objections. (ECF No. 69.) Defendant filed no response and the time for doing so has passed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the

1 Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by  
2 proper analysis. Plaintiff's objections do not raise an issue of fact or law under the  
3 findings and recommendations. Plaintiff has had numerous opportunities to challenge  
4 the screening order, which resulted in a delay in serving Defendant Ontiveroz. Plaintiff  
5 has already filed two motions for reconsideration (ECF Nos. 16, 38) and an interlocutory  
6 appeal of the Court's screening orders. (ECF Nos. 25, 42). Plaintiff's objections raise no  
7 reason for further delay. Plaintiff may appeal the Court's dismissal of the claims and  
8 defendants at the conclusion of this matter, if he so chooses.

9 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 10 1. The Court adopts the November 21, 2017, findings and recommendations  
11 (ECF No. 64) in full;
- 12 2. Plaintiff's motion for entry of final judgement (ECF No. 59) is DENIED.

13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: February 5, 2018

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill  
16 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE