1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	ANTOIAN GRIFFIN,	No. 1:17-cv-01741-DAD-MJS	
12	Plaintiff,		
13	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING	
14	JEFFREY Y. HAMILTON and GARY A.	CLAIM, AND DENYING MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS	
15	HUNT,		
16	Defendants.	(Doc. Nos. 2, 3)	
17	Plaintiff Antoian Griffin proceeds pro se in this civil rights action brought against Judge		
18	Jeffrey Y. Hamilton and attorney Gary A. Hunt. (Doc. No. 1.) The matter was referred to a		
19	United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302 of the		
20	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.		
21	On December 29, 2017, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint and		
22	determined that plaintiff's claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 failed to state a claim upon which relief		
23	may be granted and that, correspondingly, the court lacks jurisdiction over plaintiff's state law		
24	claims. (Doc. No. 3.) The magistrate judge also noted that plaintiff's application to proceed in		
25	forma pauperis was incomplete, but that since the action was without merit, the application		
26	should simply be denied. (Id.) The magistrate judge recommended that plaintiff's § 1983 claims		
27	be dismissed without leave to amend. (Id.) The findings and recommendations provided plaintiff		
28	with fourteen days in which to file objections thereto. On January 12, 2018, plaintiff filed		
		1	

1 objections. (Doc. No. 4.)

1	objections. (Doc. No. 4.)		
2	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the undersigned has		
3	conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including		
4	plaintiff's objections, the undersigned concludes the findings and recommendations are supported		
5	by the record and by proper analysis. Plaintiff's citation to the decision in Cooper v. Aaron, 358		
6	U.S. 1, 18 (1958) is no-responsive to the analysis set out in the findings and recommendations		
7	here, as that decision does not address either judicial immunity or the principle that a private		
8	attorney does not act under color of state law for purposes of § 1983.		
9	Given the foregoing:		
10	1. The findings and recommendations issued December 29, 2017 (Doc. No. 3) are adopted in		
11	full;		
12	2. The motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. No. 2) is denied;		
13	3. Plaintiff's claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 are dismissed with prejudice;		
14	4. Plaintiff's state law claims are dismissed for lack of jurisdiction;		
15	5. Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed without leave to amend; and		
16	6. The Clerk of the Court is directed to terminate any pending motions and close this case.		
17	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
18	Dated: February 12, 2018 Jale A. Dage		
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	2		
	<i>L</i>		