

1 plaintiff's notice as a request for an extension of time to respond to the court's order and granted
2 plaintiff until June 1, 2017, to file an amended complaint or a statement that she wished to
3 proceed only on her cognizable claim. (Doc. No. 13.) The court further indicated that plaintiff's
4 failure to comply with that order would result in a recommendation that this action proceed only
5 on her Eighth Amendment claim against defendant Officer Ardon. (*Id.*) Plaintiff never filed a
6 response of any kind to the magistrate judge's orders.

7 On July 5, 2017, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations,
8 recommending that this case proceed only on plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim against
9 defendant Officer Ardon as found cognizable in the January 27, 2017 screening order. (Doc. No.
10 16.) The findings and recommendation were served that same day and provided plaintiff with
11 twenty-one days in which to file objections. (*Id.*) To date, plaintiff has not filed objections.


12 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a
13 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings
14 and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

15 Accordingly,

- 16 1. The July 5, 2017 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 16) are adopted in full;
- 17 2. This action shall proceed only on plaintiff's claim against defendant Officer Ardon for
18 deliberate indifference of plaintiff's serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth
19 Amendment;
- 20 3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed; and
- 21 4. The matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings
22 consistent with this order.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: September 28, 2017

25 
26 _____
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28