UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT BISHOP, Plaintiff, v. SALCEDO, et al., Defendants.	No. 1:18-cv-00714-DAD-BAM ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING CERTAIN CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS (Doc. No. 14)

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

On December 28, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and found that it stated cognizable claims for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment against defendants Cross, Salcedo, Perez, and Nyugen, but failed to state any other cognizable claims. (Doc. No. 11.) Plaintiff was ordered to either file a first amended complaint or notify the court of his willingness to proceed only on the claims found to be cognizable in the screening order. (Doc. No. 11.) On January 28, 2019, plaintiff notified the court of his willingness to proceed on the cognizable claims identified by the court in the screening order. (Doc. No. 13.)

Accordingly, on January 30, 2019, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that this action proceed on plaintiff's deliberate indifference claims against defendants Cross, Salcedo, Perez, and Nyugen, and that all other claims and defendants be dismissed. (Doc. No. 14.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen days after service. (*Id.* at 7.) To date, no objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed, and the time in which to do so has now passed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), 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 by proper analysis.

Accordingly,

1. The findings and recommendations issued on January 30, 2019 (Doc. No. 14) are adopted in full;
2. This action shall proceed on plaintiff's complaint, filed May 25, 2018 (Doc. No. 1) against defendants Cross, Salcedo, Perez, and Nyugen for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment;
3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed with prejudice; and
4. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **April 23, 2019**

Dale A. Drozd
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE