1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CLAUDE CARR,	No. 1:17-cv-01769-DAD-SAB
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
14	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CERTAIN D	RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING CERTAIN DEFENDANTS DUE TO
15	CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION, et al.,	ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY
16	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 11)
17		
18	Plaintiff Claude Carr is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action	
19	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge	
20	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302 of this court.	
21	On May 7, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations	
22	recommending that this action proceed on plaintiff's claim against defendant Pruitt for deliberate	
23	indifference in violation of the Eighth Amendment, and that the remaining defendants, the	
24	California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the Prison Industry Authority, be	
25	dismissed based on Eleventh Amendment immunity. (Doc. No. 11.) Those findings and	
26	recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were	
27	to be filed within thirty days after service. (<i>Id.</i> at 5.) That deadline has passed, and no objections	
28	have been filed.	

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), the undersigned has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the undersigned concludes the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. Accordingly: 1. The findings and recommendations issued on May 7, 2018 (Doc. No. 11) are adopted in full; 2. This action shall proceed on plaintiff's claim against defendant Pruitt for deliberate indifference in violation of the Eighth Amendment; 3. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the Prison Industry Authority are dismissed, based on Eleventh Amendment immunity; and 4. This matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings consistent with this order. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: August 6, 2018