1		
1 2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CHARLES B. JONES,	No. 1:16-cv-01335-DAD-JLT
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
14	SPEIDELL, et al.,	RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING CERTAIN CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 25)
16		
17		
18	Plaintiff Charles B. Jones is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in	
19	this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United	
20	States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
21	On May 23, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge screened the second amended complaint	
22	and issued findings and recommendations, recommending that this action proceed on plaintiff's	
23	retaliation claims against defendants R. Speidell and M. Stewart, and that all other claims and	
24	defendants be dismissed. (Doc. No. 25.) The findings and recommendations were served on	
25	plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within twenty-one days	
26	after service. (Id. at 13.) On June 11, 2018, plaintiff filed objections. (Doc. No. 26.)	
27	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a	
28	de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff's	
		1

1	objections, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and		
2	by proper analysis.		
3	In his objections, plaintiff appears to misapprehend the scope of the recommendation set		
4	forth in the findings and recommendations and, therefore, generally restates the allegations of his		
5	complaint and contends that he has stated a claim for relief. Contrary to plaintiff's statement, the		
6	assigned magistrate judge has not recommended dismissal of all of plaintiff's claims. (See Doc.		
7	No. 26 at 1.) Accordingly, plaintiff's objections do not call the findings and recommendations		
8	into question, and the court will adopt them in full.		
9	Accordingly,		
10	1. The findings and recommendations issued on May 23, 2018 (Doc. No. 25) are		
11	adopted in full;		
12	2. This action shall proceed on the claim in plaintiff's second amended complaint		
13	(Doc. No. 21) against defendants R. Speidell and M. Stewart for retaliation in		
14	violation of the First Amendment;		
15	3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed; and		
16	4. The matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further		
17	proceedings consistent with this order.		
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
19	Dated: November 27, 2018 Jale A. Jugd		
20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	2		