

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  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KAREEM J. HOWELL,	)	1:18-cv-00467-BAM (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
	)	RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING
v.	)	CERTAIN CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS
	)	
S. BABB, et al.,	)	(Doc. No. 11)
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

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

On August 8, 2018, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations finding that Plaintiff’s amended complaint states cognizable claims against Defendants Babb, Tumacder and Gallagher for a violation of his Fourteenth Amendment due process rights and for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment. (Doc. No. 11.) The Magistrate Judge further recommending dismissing all other claims and defendants for the failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. (*Id.* at 6.) Those findings and recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days. (*Id.* at 7.) More than fourteen days have passed, and no objections have been filed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that

1 the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper  
2 analysis.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

4 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on August 8, 2018, (Doc. No. 11) are  
5 adopted in full;

6 2. This action proceeds on Plaintiff’s first amended complaint against Defendants  
7 Babb, Tumacder and Gallagher for a violation of his Fourteenth Amendment due process rights  
8 and for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment;

9 3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed from this action for the failure to  
10 state a cognizable claim; and

11 4. This matter is referred back to the assigned Magistrate Judge for further  
12 proceedings consistent with this order.

13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: September 5, 2018

/s/ Lawrence J. O’Neill  
16 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE