UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KAREEM J. HOWELL,

Plaintiff,

V.

J. BURNS, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-00311-LJO-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(ECF Nos. 10, 11)

Kareem J. Howell ("Plaintiff") is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On June 22, 2018, Magistrate Judge Grosjean entered findings and recommendations, recommending that Plaintiff's claims for excessive force in violation of the Eighth Amendment against Defendant D. Lopez, for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment against Defendants D. Lopez and J. Burns, and for interference with the mail and retaliation in violation of the First Amendment against Defendant J. Holland be allowed to proceed, and that all other claims and defendants be dismissed with prejudice. (ECF No. 11 at 10). Plaintiff was provided an opportunity to file objections to the findings and recommendations within twenty-one days. The deadline has expired, and Plaintiff has not filed objections.

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, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations issued by the Magistrate Judge on June 22, 2018, (ECF No. 11), are ADOPTED in full;
- 2. This action may proceed on Plaintiff's claims for excessive force in violation of the Eighth Amendment against Defendant D. Lopez, for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment against Defendants D. Lopez and J. Burns, and for interference with the mail and retaliation in violation of the First Amendment against Defendant J. Holland;
- 3. All other claims and all other defendants are dismissed; and
- 4. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to reflect the dismissal of Defendant M. Sexton on the Court's docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 9, 2018 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE