

1 for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need against defendants D. Mendivil and John
2 Does 1, 2, and 3, and that all other claims and defendants be dismissed from this action. (Doc.
3 No. 8.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that
4 objections thereto were to be filed within twenty-one days. (*Id.*) Plaintiff filed objections on
5 December 13, 2017. However, plaintiff's objections do not provide a legal basis upon which to
6 question the analysis set forth in the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations. (Doc. No.
7 9.)

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

11 Accordingly,

- 12 1. The findings and recommendations dated November 22, 2017 (Doc. No. 8) are
13 adopted in full;
- 14 2. This action shall proceed solely on plaintiff's claim of deliberate indifference to a
15 serious medical need against defendants D. Mendivil and John Does 1, 2, and 3;
- 16 3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed from this action due to plaintiff's
17 failure to state a cognizable claim for relief; and
- 18 4. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for initiation of
19 service of process and further proceedings.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: February 20, 2018

22 
23 _____
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25
26
27
28