

1 construed as a notice that he wished to proceed only the claims found cognizable in the screening
2 order. (Doc. No. 18 at 1).

3 Thus, on May 20, 2021, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations,
4 recommending that this action be allowed to proceed against defendants Agundez and Urrutia for
5 their alleged use of excessive force and against defendant Dominguez for alleged retaliation and
6 recommending that all other claims and defendant Chavez be dismissed. (Doc. No. 18 at 8.) The
7 findings and recommendations served on plaintiff contained notice that any objections thereto
8 were to be filed within twenty-one (21) days. (*Id.*) On June 14, 2021, plaintiff filed a notice¹ that
9 he “[ac]cepted the recommendations,” which the court construes as a statement of plaintiff’s lack
10 of objection. (Doc. No. 19.)

11 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a
12 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the file, including plaintiff’s statement of
13 no objection, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and
14 proper analysis.

15 Accordingly,

- 16 1. The findings and recommendations issued on May 20, 2021 (Doc. No. 18) are
17 adopted in full;
- 18 2. This action shall proceed only against defendants Agundez and Urrutia for their
19 alleged use of excessive force and against defendant Dominguez for alleged
20 retaliation;
- 21 3. Defendant Chavez is dismissed from this action;
- 22 4. All other claims are dismissed from this action; and
- 23 5. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings
24 consistent with this order.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: July 11, 2021

27 
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

28 ¹ The document was erroneously docketed as objections.