



1 with process, before jurisdiction may vest in a magistrate judge to dispose of a civil case.  
2 *Williams v. King*, 875 F.3d 500, 504 (9th Cir. 2017). Accordingly, the magistrate judge did not  
3 have jurisdiction to dismiss the above-described claims by way of the April 17, 2017 order.  
4 Therefore, on November 30, 2017, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations  
5 recommending that this action proceed on plaintiff's claim of excessive use of force against  
6 defendants Robles and Hernandez and that all other claims and defendants be dismissed for  
7 failure to state a cognizable claim for relief. The findings and recommendations were served on  
8 the parties and contained notice that objections were to be filed within fourteen days. No  
9 objections were filed and the time period in which to do so has expired.

10 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, the  
11 undersigned has conducted a de novo review of the case. The undersigned concludes the findings  
12 and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

13 Given the foregoing,

- 14 1. The November 30, 2017 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 44) are adopted in full;
- 15 2. This action proceeds against defendants Robles and Hernandez on plaintiff's excessive  
16 use of force claim; and
- 17 3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed from the action for failure to state a  
18 cognizable claim for relief.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: January 7, 2018

21   
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28