

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

11 JERALD MORRIS LARRY,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 S. GOODWIN, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16  
17

1:17-cv-00172-DAD-GSA-PC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS,  
RECOMMENDING THAT THIS ACTION  
PROCEED ONLY AGAINST DEFENDANTS  
GOODWIN AND REIS, ON PLAINTIFF'S  
EIGHTH AMENDMENT CONDITIONS OF  
CONFINEMENT CLAIMS, AND THAT ALL  
OTHER CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS BE  
DISMISSED

OBJECTIONS, IF ANY, DUE IN 14 DAYS

18 **I. BACKGROUND**

19 Jerald Morris Larry ("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. On February 8, 2017,  
21 Plaintiff filed the Complaint commencing this action. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff named as  
22 defendants S. Goodwin (Supervisor Cook), Reis (Supervisor Cook I), and John Does #1 and #2  
23 (Maintenance Workers). (Id.)

24 The court screened Plaintiff's Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and found that  
25 it states cognizable Eighth Amendment claims for adverse conditions of confinement under §  
26 1983 against defendants Reis and Goodwin. (ECF No. 11.) On October 10, 2017, Plaintiff was  
27 granted leave to either file an amended complaint or notify the court that he is willing to  
28 proceed only on the claims found cognizable by the court. (Id.) On October 27, 2017, Plaintiff

1 filed a notice informing the court that he does not wish to file an amended complaint and would  
2 like to proceed only on the cognizable Eighth Amendment claims against defendants Reis and  
3 Goodwin. (ECF No. 12.)

## 4 **II. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

5 Based on the foregoing, it is **HEREBY RECOMMENDED** that:

- 6 1. This action proceed only against defendants S. Goodwin (Supervisor Cook) and  
7 Reis (Supervisor Cook I), on Plaintiff's claims for adverse conditions of  
8 confinement under the Eighth Amendment;
- 9 2. All remaining claims and defendants be dismissed from this action; and
- 10 3. Defendants John Does #1 and #2 (Maintenance Workers) be dismissed from this  
11 action based on Plaintiff's failure to state any claims upon which relief may be  
12 granted against them.

13 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District  
14 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within  
15 fourteen (14) days after the date of service of these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff  
16 may file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to  
17 Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file  
18 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.  
19 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

20  
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: October 31, 2017

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28