

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

VANCE EDWARD JOHNSON,  
  
  Plaintiff,  
  
  v.  
  
S. HONNOLD,  
  
  Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:15-cv-01118-LJO-MJS (PC)  
  
ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DISMISSAL  
OF CERTAIN OF PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS  
AND DEFENDANTS  
  
(ECF No. 14)

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF Nos. 1 & 6.) 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 September 29, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations (ECF No. 14) that (1) Plaintiff should proceed on Eighth Amendment medical indifference claim against Defendant Honnold, and (2) all other claims asserted in the Complaint and all other named Defendants should be dismissed. After filing a notice with the Court agreeing to only proceed with his cognizable medical indifference claim against Defendant Honnold (ECF No. 13.), Plaintiff objected to the Findings and

1 Recommendations arguing that he had stated a cognizable retaliation claim against  
2 Defendant. (ECF No. 15.) The Magistrate Judge ordered Plaintiff to clarify his position.  
3 (ECF No. 16.) Plaintiff has indicated that he agrees to proceed with only the medical  
4 indifference claim against Defendant Honnold. (ECF No. 17.)

5 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has  
6 conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the  
7 Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by  
8 proper analysis.

9 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 10 1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 14), filed on September 29,  
11 2015, are adopted in full;
- 12 2. Plaintiff is to proceed on the Eighth Amendment medical indifference claim  
13 against Defendant Honnold; and
- 14 3. All other claims asserted in the First Amended Complaint and all other named  
15 Defendants are dismissed with prejudice.

16  
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: December 4, 2015

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