1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	WILLIAM J. JONES,	No. 1:19-cv-00477-DAD-JDP (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
14	WARDEN J. SULLIVAN,	CASE
15	Defendant.	(Doc. No. 10)
16		
17		
18	Plaintiff William J. Jones is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in	
19	this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United	
20	States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
21	On March 3, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint and issued	
22	findings and recommendations, recommending that plaintiff's case be dismissed with prejudice	
23	due to his repeated failures <sup>1</sup> to state a cognizable claim. (Doc. No. 10.) The findings and	
24	recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were	
25	/////	
26		
27	<ul> <li>Plaintiff originally filed a petition for federal habeas relief. (Doc. No. 1.) With the court's permission, he filed an amended pleading, which appeared to allege a § 1983 claim. (Doc. No. 3.) The court then permitted plaintiff to convert his habeas petition to a § 1983 action. (Doc. Nos. 5, 6.)</li> </ul>	
28		
		1

to be filed within fourteen (14) days of service. (Id. at 4.) On March 30, 2020, plaintiff filed untimely objections.<sup>2</sup> (Doc. No. 11.) In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the findings and recommendation are supported by the record and proper analysis. Accordingly, The findings and recommendations issued on March 3, 2020 (Doc. No. 10) are 1. adopted in full; 2. Plaintiff's action is dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim; and 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **April 21, 2020** Although untimely filed, the court has nonetheless considered plaintiff's objections. However,

Although untimely filed, the court has nonetheless considered plaintiff's objections. However therein plaintiff merely reiterates the factual allegations contained in his complaint and fails to meaningfully address the magistrate judge's legal reasoning or findings. (Doc. No. 11.)