1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JARED VILLERY,	No. 1:15-cv-01360-DAD-MJS
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
14	JAY JONES, et al.,	RECOMMENDATIONS (Doc No. 10)
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 19)
16		
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights	
18	action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States	
19	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On November 13, 2017, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's first amended	
21	complaint and found that it states cognizable First Amendment claims against defendants Jones,	
22	Schmidt, Yerton, Escarcega and Nelson, but no other cognizable claims. (Doc. No. 19.) The	
23	magistrate judge therefore recommended that plaintiff be allowed to proceed on the cognizable	
24	claims identified in the screening order, and that all other claims and defendants be dismissed	
25	from this action. The parties were provided fourteen days to file objections to those findings and	
26	recommendations. (Id.) To date, neither party has done so, and the time for doing so has now	
27	passed.	
28	/////	
	1	_

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 court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations issued November 13, 2017 (Doc. No. 19) are adopted in full; 2. Plaintiff shall proceed in this action on his First Amendment claims against defendants Jones, Schmidt, Yerton, Escarcega and Nelson; and 3. All other claims alleged in plaintiff's first amended complaint and all other defendants named therein are dismissed from this action. IT IS SO ORDERED. **January 10, 2018** Dated: