1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JORGE FERNANDEZ,	No. 1:19-cv-01220-DAD-JLT (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14	SATTERFIELD, et al.,	(Doc. No. 17)
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Jorge Fernandez is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in	
18	this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States	
19	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On February 7, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued a screening order, finding that	
21	plaintiff's complaint states cognizable claims against defendants Satterfield, Eslick, Jackson, and	
22	C. Salzer, ¹ but not against defendant Flores. (Doc. No. 13.) Pursuant to the screening order,	
23	plaintiff filed a notice stating that he elected to proceed only against defendants Satterfield,	
24	Eslick, Jackson, and C. Salzer on the claims found to be cognizable by the screening order rather	
25	than attempt to amend. (Doc. No. 14.)	
26	¹ Plaintiff states that he misspelled defendant C. Salzer's name as "Salazar" in his complaint. (Doc. No. 14 at 1.) Therefore, the magistrate judge substituted defendant "C. Salzer" for "Salazar" and directed the Clerk of the Court to update the docket to reflect the	
27		
28	correction/substitution. (Doc. No. 18 at 1.)	1

1	Accordingly, on February 27, 2020, the magistrate judge issued findings and	
2	recommendations, recommending that defendant Flores be dismissed from this action. (Doc. No.	
3	17.) Plaintiff was granted fourteen (14) days in which to file objections to the findings and	
4	recommendations. (Id. at 2.) No objections have been filed, and the time in which to do so has	
5	passed.	
6	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a	
7	de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and	
8	recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.	
9	Accordingly:	
10	1. The findings and recommendations issued on February 27, 2020 (Doc. No. 17) are	
11	adopted in full;	
12	2. This action proceeds only against defendants Satterfield, Eslick, Jackson, and C.	
13	Salzer;	
14	3. Defendant Flores is dismissed from this action; and	
15	4. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings.	
16	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
17	Dated: April 28, 2020 Dale A. Drogd	
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	2	