

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. 35.) Concurrently, the Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations
5 recommending that the undersigned dismiss the non-cognizable claims and deny the
6 request for preliminary injunctive relief. (Id.) The parties were given fourteen days to file
7 objections to those findings and recommendations. No objections were filed, and the
8 time in which to do so has now passed.

9 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304,
10 the Court has conducted a de novo review of Plaintiff's case. The Court finds the findings
11 and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

12 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations issued December 8, 2017 are adopted
14 in full;
- 15 2. The action shall continue to proceed only on Plaintiff's cognizable Eighth
16 Amendment claim for damages and permanent injunctive relief against
17 Defendant Kandkhorova; and
- 18 3. All other claims are dismissed with prejudice;
- 19 4. Plaintiff's request for preliminary injunctive relief is denied.

20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: February 2, 2018



23 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28