## 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 LAMAR JORDAN, No. 1:20-cv-0467 JLT EPG (PC) 12 Plaintiff. ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING 13 DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY v. **JUDGMENT** 14 E. ANUNCIACION, et al., (Docs. 52, 63) 15 Defendants. 16 17 The plaintiff asserts he suffered violations of his Eighth Amendment rights while 18 incarcerated. He contends Napoles and Anunciacion, both of whom are dentists, were 19 deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs related to post-operative dental care. (See 20 Doc. 1.) 21 Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. (Doc. 52.) The assigned magistrate 22 judge found there were "genuine disputes of material fact regarding whether Defendants knowingly disregarded Plaintiff's serious medical needs." (Doc. 63 at 2, 19.) Therefore, the 23 24 magistrate judge recommended the motion for summary judgment be denied. (*Id.*) The Court granted the parties 21 days to file any objections to the Findings and 25 26 Recommendations. (Doc. 63 at 19.) In addition, the Court advised them "that failure to file 27 objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal." (Id., citing

Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014), Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391,

28

1394 (9th Cir. 1991).) The deadline to file objections has passed and no objections were filed. According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire matter, the Court concludes the magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. Thus, the Court **ORDERS**: 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on June 28, 2022 (Doc. 63), are **ADOPTED** in full. 2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Doc. 52) is **DENIED**. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: August 2, 2022