1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JUAN MONTENEGRO,	No. 1:19-cv-00430-DAD-SAB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING
14	DAVID MOORE, et al.,	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
15	Defendants.	(Doc. Nos. 32, 33)
16		(Doc. 1908. 32, 33)
17		
18	Plaintiff Juan Montenegro is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights	
19	action 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.	
21	On January 23, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations,	
22	recommending that plaintiff's motion for summary judgment be denied without prejudice. (Doc.	
23	No. 33.) As the magistrate judge noted, discovery only commenced in this action on December 4,	
24	2019, and defendants have not been provided the opportunity to complete discovery and obtain	
25	information necessary to oppose plaintiff's motion. (Id.) Moreover, plaintiff's motion does not	
26	comply with Local Rule 260(a), as it fails to include a Statement of Undisputed Facts	
27	enumerating the evidence on which plaintiff is relying for his motion for summary judgment.	
28	(See Doc. No. 32.) The findings and recommendations were served on both parties and contained	

notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days of service. (Id.) No objections have been filed and the time to do so has now passed. In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, the court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Accordingly: 1. The findings and recommendations filed on January 23, 2020 (Doc. No. 33) are adopted in full; 2. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment filed on January 21, 2020 (Doc. No. 32) is denied without prejudice; and 3. The matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **April 21, 2020**