1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JEREMY JONES,	No. 1:16-cv-01212-DAD-GSA (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14	ARNETTE, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 36)
16		
17	Plaintiff Jeremey Jones is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this	
18	civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United	
19	States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On October 9, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's second amended	
21	complaint and issued findings and recommendations, recommending that this action proceed only	
22	on: (1) plaintiff's Americans With Disabilities Act ("ADA") claims against defendants Vasquez,	
23	Keener, Gonzalez, Flores, Arnette, Zamora, and Lopez in their official capacities only;	
24	(2) plaintiff's Eighth Amendment conditions of confinement claims against defendants Vasquez,	
25	Keener, and Gonzalez; and (3) plaintiff's due process claims against defendants Vasquez, Keener,	
26	and Gonzalez. (Doc. No. 36.) The magistrate judge recommended dismissal of all other claims	
27	and defendants without further leave to amend for failure to state a claim. (Id. at 19.) The	
28	findings and recommendation were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections	

1	were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. ( <i>Id.</i> at 20.) On February 12, 2019, after	
2	seeking and receiving two extensions to file objections to the findings and recommendations	
3	(Doc. Nos. 38, 40), plaintiff filed a notice of his willingness to proceed with the claims found	
4	cognizable in the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 42.)	
5	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, the	
6	undersigned has conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire	
7	file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by	
8	proper analysis.	
9	Accordingly,	
10	1. The findings and recommendations issued on October 9, 2018 (Doc. No. 36) are	
11	adopted in full;	
12	2. This action now proceeds only on:	
13	a. Plaintiff's ADA claims against defendants Vasquez, Keener, Gonzalez,	
14	Flores, Arnette, Zamora, and Lopez in their official capacities;	
15	b. Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment conditions of confinement claims against	
16	defendants Vasquez, Keener, and Gonzalez;	
17	c. Plaintiff's due process claims against defendants Vasquez, Keener, and	
18	Gonzalez;	
19	3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed; and	
20	4. The matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further	
21	proceedings consistent with this order.	
22	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
23	Dated: June 4 2020	
24	Dated: June 4, 2020 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
25		