UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM J. GRADFORD, Plaintiff, v. DEPUTY MCDOUGALL, Defendant.	No. 1:17-cv-00575-DAD-GSA ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND PERMITTING THIS CASE TO PROCEED ON PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM FOR MAIL INTERFERENCE UNDER THE SIXTH AMENDMENT, AND DISMISSING ALL OTHER CLAIMS (Doc. No. 18)

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

On August 29, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that this action proceed only against defendant McDougall for interference with plaintiff's mail in violation of the Sixth Amendment, and that all other claims be dismissed from this action based on plaintiff's failure to state a claim. (Doc. No. 18.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen days after service. (*Id.* at 2.) On September 6, 2018, plaintiff filed a statement of non-opposition to the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 19.)

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

Accordingly,

1. The findings and recommendations issued on August 29, 2018 (Doc. No. 18) are adopted in full;
2. This action now proceeds with plaintiff's second amended complaint, filed on May 9, 2018 (Doc. No. 15), against defendant McDougall on plaintiff's claim for mail interference in violation of the Sixth Amendment;
3. All remaining claims are dismissed from this action; and
4. This case is referred back to the magistrate judge for further proceedings, including initiation of service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **November 6, 2018**

Dale A. Drozd
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE