

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KAREEM J. HOWELL,)	Case No.: 1:20-cv-00114-NONE-SAB (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	<u>ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND</u>
v.)	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS, AND DISMISSING</u>
)	<u>CERTAIN CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS</u>
MEDINA, et.al.,)	
)	(Doc. No. 15)
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	
)	

19 Plaintiff Karen J. Howell is appearing *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action
20 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

21 On February 4, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff’s complaint and found
22 that plaintiff stated a cognizable retaliation claim against Defendants Medina, Bennett, J. Burnes, J.
23 Navarro, A. Randolph, and J. Gallagher. (Doc. No. 12.) The court granted plaintiff leave to file an
24 amended complaint or notify the court of intent to proceed only on the claim found to be cognizable.
25 (*Id.*)

26 On February 20, 2020, plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the retaliation claim found
27 to be cognizable and dismiss all other claims and defendants. (Doc. No. 13.) On February 21, 2020,
28 the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that this action

1 proceed against defendants Medina, Bennett, J. Burnes, J. Navarro, A. Randolph, and J. Gallagher for
2 retaliation in violation of the First Amendment. (Doc. No. 15.) The magistrate judge also
3 recommended that all other claims and defendants be dismissed. (*Id.*) The findings and
4 recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be
5 filed within fourteen days after service. (*Id.*) No objections have been filed and the time in which to
6 do so has now passed.

7 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this court
8 has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds
9 the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

10 Accordingly,

- 11 1. The findings and recommendations issued on February 21, 2020 (Doc. No. 15) are
12 adopted;
- 13 2. This action shall proceed against defendants Medina, Bennett, J. Burnes, J. Navarro, A.
14 Randolph, and J. Gallagher for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment;
- 15 3. All other claims and defendants are dismissed from the action, without prejudice; and
- 16 4. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings
17 consistent with this order.

18
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: March 31, 2020


DALE A. INGO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE