1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MATTHEW V. SALINAS,	No. 1:16-cv-00520-DAD-GSA (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
14	KENNETH J. POGUE, et al.,	RECOMMENDATIONS (D. N. 46)
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 46)
16		
17	Plaintiff Matthew V. Salinas is a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this	
18	civil rights action 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 February 16, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and	
21	recommendations, recommending that this action proceed only against defendants Gomness and	
22	Palmer for violation of the ADA and related state claims. (Doc. No. 46.) Plaintiff was provided	
23	an opportunity to file objections to the findings and recommendations within fourteen days. (<i>Id.</i>)	
24	On February 28, 2018, plaintiff filed a notice of non-opposition to the findings and	
25	recommendations, stating that he is willing to proceed in this action only against defendants	
26	Gomness and Palmer for violation of the ADA and related state claims. (Doc. No. 47.)	
27	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this	
28	court has conducted a <i>de novo</i> 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 proper analysis.	
2	Accordingly,	
3	1. The findings and recommendations issued by the magistrate judge on February 16,	
4	2018 (Doc. No. 46) are adopted in full;	
5	2. This action now proceeds with plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint, filed on	
6	January 19, 2018, against defendants Gomness and Palmer, for violation of the	
7	ADA and related state claims;	
8	3. All remaining claims and defendants are dismissed from this action;	
9	4. Defendant Herrera is dismissed from this case for plaintiff's failure to state any	
10	claims against him;	
11	5. Plaintiff's claim for retaliation is dismissed from this case for plaintiff's failure to	
12	state a claim;	
13	6. The Clerk of the Court is directed to reflect the dismissal of defendant Herrera	
14	from this case on the court's docket; and	
15	7. This case is referred back to the magistrate judge for further proceedings,	
16	including initiation of service of process.	
17	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
18	Dated: April 26, 2018	
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		