

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
8

9 ARCHIE CRANFORD,

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 TINA M. ADAMS, et al.,

13 Defendants.  
14  
15  
16

1:16-cv-00783-AWI-GSA-PC

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
(ECF No. 33.)**

**ORDER DISMISSING CLAIMS AND  
DEFENDANTS CONSISTENT WITH  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S PRIOR ORDER IN  
LIGHT OF WILLIAMS DECISION**

**ORDER ASSIGNING CASE TO MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE GARY S. AUSTIN**

17 Archie Cranford ("Plaintiff") is a civil detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in forma*  
18 *pauperis* with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to  
19 a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

20 On December 13, 2017, the court entered [findings and recommendations](#),  
21 recommending that claims and defendants be dismissed consistent with the magistrate judge's  
22 prior order in light of the *Williams*<sup>1</sup> decision. (ECF No. 33.) On December 26, 2017, Plaintiff  
23 filed [objections](#) to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 34.)

24 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this  
25 court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file,  
26 including plaintiff's objections, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be  
27 supported by the record and proper analysis.

28  

---

<sup>1</sup> *Williams v. King*, 875 F.3d 500 (9th Cir. 2017).

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 2 1. The findings and recommendations entered by the magistrate judge on  
3 December 13, 2017, are ADOPTED in full;
- 4 2. Consistent with the magistrate judge's prior screening order issued on March 30,  
5 2017, claims and defendants are DISMISSED from the Complaint as follows,  
6 for the reasons provided in the court's March 30, 2017, screening order:
- 7 (1) Defendants Tina M. Adams, (Psych Tech), Jessica C. (Psych Tech),  
8 Patient V. (Psych Tech), and Barbara Niewesas are DISMISSED from  
9 this action for Plaintiff's failure to state any claims under § 1983 against  
10 them upon which relief may be granted; and
- 11 (2) Plaintiff's claims based on inadequate medical care and right to privacy  
12 are DISMISSED from this action based on Plaintiff's failure to state a  
13 claim;
- 14 3. It appearing that all parties to this action have consented to magistrate judge  
15 jurisdiction, this case is ASSIGNED to Magistrate Judge Gary S. Austin for all  
16 purposes within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), to conduct any and all  
17 further proceedings in this case, including trial and entry of final judgment;
- 18 4. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to assign this action in its entirety to  
19 Magistrate Judge Gary S. Austin;
- 20 5. The new case number is 1:16-cv-00783-GSA-PC; and
- 21 6. This case is referred to Magistrate Judge Gary S. Austin for all further  
22 proceedings.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: January 10, 2018

25   
26 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE  
27  
28