1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	KAREEM J. HOWELL,	No. 1:19-cv-00854-DAD-GSA (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
14	M. DO CANTO, et al.,	CERTAIN CLAIMS
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 14)
16		
17	Plaintiff Kareem J. Howell is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in	
18	this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United	
19	States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On August 21, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint in this	
21	action and found that plaintiff had stated a cognizable claim against defendant M. Do Canto for	
22	retaliation in violation of the First Amendment, but that plaintiff had failed to state any other	
23	cognizable claims against defendant M. Do Canto or any other named defendants. (Doc. No. 11.)	
24	Plaintiff was granted leave to file an amended complaint or notify the court of his willingness to	
25	proceed only on the claims found to be cognizable in the screening order within thirty (30) days	
26	after service of the screening order. ( <i>Id.</i> at 12.) On September 3, 2020, plaintiff notified the court	
27	that he was willing to proceed only on the claim identified by the magistrate judge in the	
28	screening order as cognizable. (Doc. No. 12.)	

Consequently, on September 8, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that this action proceed on plaintiff's claim brought against defendant M. Do Canto for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment. (Doc. No. 14.) The magistrate judge also recommended that all other claims brought and defendants named by plaintiff in his complaint be dismissed. (*Id.* at 2.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.*) No objections 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 the 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 issued on September 8, 2020 (Doc. No. 14) are adopted in full;
- 2. This action shall proceed on plaintiff's claim against defendant M. Do Canto for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment;
- 3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed; and
- 4. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings consistent with this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 13, 2020** 

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE