## 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 No. 1:17-cv-01062-DAD-SAB MORRIS ROBERSON, 12 Plaintiff. ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 13 v. 14 A. MANASRAH, et al., (Doc. No. 18) 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff Morris Roberson is a state prisoner appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in 18 this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 19 On October 31, 2017, the assigned magistrate judge screened the first amended complaint 20 and issued findings and recommendations recommending that this action proceed against 21 defendant Pfeiffer for failing to take reasonable measures to protect plaintiff from contracting 22 Valley Fever in violation of the Eighth Amendment; that plaintiff's claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need be dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim for 23 24

25

26

27

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Plaintiff objects to the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss plaintiff's claim against defendants Manasrah and Ogbuehi for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need. (Doc. No. 19 at 1.) Plaintiff alleges that on January 5, 2015, plaintiff told defendant Manasrah that he had been experiencing "excruciatingly sharp pain in his head, throat, neck, and stomach for several days." (Doc. No. 14 at 8.) According to plaintiff, defendant Manasrah was dismissive of plaintiff's complaints and "purposely" denied treatment and issued false reports that plaintiff was in no obvious distress and had a normal gait. (*Id.* at 42.) Plaintiff also alleges that on multiple occasions in April, May, and June of 2016, he submitted forms complaining of shortness of breath, muscle cramping, chest pain, joint pain, severe headaches, night sweats, and coughing. (*Id.*) Plaintiff claims that each time, defendants Manasrah and Ogbuehi told plaintiff that he was fine and refused to do anything to treat plaintiff's symptoms. (*Id.*) As the magistrate judge found, these conclusory allegations are insufficient to state a cognizable claim that defendants were aware that plaintiff had a serious medical condition and failed to adequately respond.

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

## Accordingly:

- The findings and recommendations issued October 31, 2017 (Doc. No. 18) are adopted;
- This action now proceeds only on plaintiff's claim brought against defendant
   Pfeiffer for failing to take reasonable measures to protect plaintiff from contracting
   Valley Fever, in violation of the Eighth Amendment;
- 3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to state a cognizable claim upon which relief may be granted;
- 4. Plaintiff's motions for a status report (Doc. Nos. 20, 21) are denied as moot; and

27 /////

28 /////

1	5. This matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for initiation of	
2	service of process.	
3		
4	4	Dale A. Dragd
5	Dated: <b>April 5, 2019</b> UNI	ITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
6	5	
7	7	
8	3	
9		
10	)	
11	1	
12	2	
13	3	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21 22		
23		
23 24		
25		
26		
27		
_ ′		