

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 LARRY WILLIAM CORTINAS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 M. HUERTA, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16
17
18

1:17-cv-00130-AWI-GSA-PC

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS
(ECF No. 22.)**

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

19 Larry William Cortinas ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma*
20 *pauperis* with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to
21 a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

22 On December 15, 2017, the court entered findings and recommendations,
23 recommending that claims and defendants be dismissed consistent with the magistrate judge's
24 prior order in light of the *Williams v. King*, 875 F.3d 500 (9th Cir. 2017). (ECF No. 22.) The
25 parties were granted fourteen days in which to file objections to the findings and
26 recommendations. (*Id.*) The fourteen-day time period has expired, and no objections have
27 been filed.
28

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

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. The findings and recommendations entered by the magistrate judge on
7 December 15, 2017, are ADOPTED in full;
 - 8 2. For the reasons provided in the September 13, 2017, screening order, the
9 following claims and defendants are DISMISSED from the Complaint:
 - 10 a. Defendants Lieutenant A. Ruiz, Sergeant A. Randolph, and five Doe
11 Defendants are dismissed from this action for Plaintiff's failure to state
12 any claims under § 1983 against them upon which relief may be granted;
 - 13 b. Plaintiff's claims for failure to protect him and inadequate medical care
14 are dismissed from this action based on Plaintiff's failure to state a
15 claim;
- 16 and
- 17 3. This case is referred back to the magistrate judge for further proceedings.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: June 7, 2018

20 
21 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE