

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
6

7 TRENELL MONSON,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 UNKNOWN FLOOR OFFICERS,  
11 Defendants.  
12  
13  
14  
15

Case No. 1:17-cv-00395-AWI-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

(ECF NOS. 10 & 11)

ORDER FOR THIS ACTION TO  
PROCEED AGAINST DEFENDANTS  
UNKNOWN OFFICER 1 AND UNKNOWN  
OFFICER 2 FOR FAILURE TO PROTECT  
IN VIOLATION OF THE FOURTEENTH  
AMENDMENT, AND DISMISSING ALL  
OTHER CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS  
WITH PREJUDICE

16 Trenell Monson (“Plaintiff”) is a pretrial detainee being held at Fresno County Jail. He  
17 is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42  
18 U.S.C. § 1983. This case now proceeds on Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint, which was  
19 filed on August 28, 2017. (ECF No. 10). The matter was referred to a United States magistrate  
20 judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

21 On September 28, 2017, Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean entered findings and  
22 recommendations, recommending that this action proceed against defendants Unknown Officer  
23 1 and Unknown Officer 2 on Plaintiff’s claim for failure to protect in violation of the  
24 Fourteenth Amendment, and that all other claims and defendants be dismissed with prejudice.  
25 (ECF No. 11). Plaintiff was provided an opportunity to file objections to the findings and  
26 recommendations within twenty-one days. Plaintiff did not file objections or otherwise  
27 respond to the findings and recommendations.  
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, THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS that:

- 6 1. The findings and recommendations issued by the magistrate judge on September  
7 28, 2017, are ADOPTED in full;
- 8 2. This action now proceeds on Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint (ECF No.  
9 10) against defendants Unknown Officer 1 and Unknown Officer 2 on Plaintiff's  
10 claim for failure to protect in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment;
- 11 3. All other claims and defendants are DISMISSED from this action, with  
12 prejudice; and
- 13 5. This case is referred back to the magistrate judge for further proceedings.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: November 17, 2017

16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE