1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JORDAN LEE EMBREY,	No. 1:20-cv-00650-DAD-BAM (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
14	MCCOMAS, et al.,	NON-COGNIZABLE CLAIMS
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 12)
16		
17		
17 18	Plaintiff Jordan Lee Embrey is a state	prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> in this civil rights action
	Plaintiff Jordan Lee Embrey is a state pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was	
18	·	s referred to a United States Magistrate Judge
18 19	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was	s referred to a United States Magistrate Judge al Rule 302.
18 19 20	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Loc. On September 25, 2020, the assigned in	s referred to a United States Magistrate Judge al Rule 302.
18 19 20 21	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Loc. On September 25, 2020, the assigned in	s referred to a United States Magistrate Judge al Rule 302. magistrate judge issued findings and ion proceed on plaintiff's first amended complaint
18 19 20 21 22	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Loc. On September 25, 2020, the assigned recommendations, recommending that this act on plaintiff's medical deliberate indifference of	s referred to a United States Magistrate Judge al Rule 302. magistrate judge issued findings and ion proceed on plaintiff's first amended complaint
18 19 20 21 22 23	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Loc. On September 25, 2020, the assigned recommendations, recommending that this act on plaintiff's medical deliberate indifference of Williams. (Doc. No. 12.) The magistrate judge	s referred to a United States Magistrate Judge al Rule 302. magistrate judge issued findings and ion proceed on plaintiff's first amended complaint claim against defendants Dr. Obendena and
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local On September 25, 2020, the assigned recommendations, recommending that this act on plaintiff's medical deliberate indifference of Williams. (Doc. No. 12.) The magistrate judgand all other defendants be dismissed from this	s referred to a United States Magistrate Judge al Rule 302. magistrate judge issued findings and ion proceed on plaintiff's first amended complaint claim against defendants Dr. Obendena and ge further recommended that all other federal claims
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Loc. On September 25, 2020, the assigned recommendations, recommending that this act on plaintiff's medical deliberate indifference of Williams. (Doc. No. 12.) The magistrate judg and all other defendants be dismissed from this upon which relief may be granted. (<i>Id.</i>) The	s referred to a United States Magistrate Judge al Rule 302. magistrate judge issued findings and ion proceed on plaintiff's first amended complaint claim against defendants Dr. Obendena and ge further recommended that all other federal claims a action based on plaintiff's failure to state claims
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Loc. On September 25, 2020, the assigned recommendations, recommending that this act on plaintiff's medical deliberate indifference of Williams. (Doc. No. 12.) The magistrate judg and all other defendants be dismissed from this upon which relief may be granted. (<i>Id.</i>) The	s referred to a United States Magistrate Judge al Rule 302. magistrate judge issued findings and ion proceed on plaintiff's first amended complaint claim against defendants Dr. Obendena and ge further recommended that all other federal claims action based on plaintiff's failure to state claims findings and recommendations were served on

days from the date of service. (*Id.*) To date, no objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed with the court, 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 finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. Accordingly: 1. The findings and recommendations issued on September 25, 2020 (Doc. No. 12) are adopted in full; 2. This action proceeds on plaintiff's first amended complaint, filed September 1, 2020 (Doc. No. 10), against defendants Obendena and Williams for deliberate indifference to plaintiff's serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment; 3. All other federal claims and all other defendants are dismissed from this action due to plaintiff's failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; and 4. This action is referred back to the magistrate judge for proceedings consistent with this order. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 19, 2020