

1 Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint or otherwise respond to the order.

2 Accordingly, on December 1, 2020, the magistrate judge issued findings and
3 recommendations, recommending that (1) Defendants Adams, Brooks, Chastain, Comates, Davis,
4 Grannis, Guzman, Hough, Junious, Neri, Rosenthal, Sheppard-Brooks, and Wortmanbe be
5 dismissed, and (2) the claims in Plaintiff's third-amended complaint be dismissed, except for its
6 claims of retaliation against Defendants Daveiga and Ruiz. Doc. No. 270. The findings and
7 recommendations were served on Plaintiff and provided him fourteen days to file objections
8 thereto. Id. at 2. Plaintiff has not filed any objections and the time to do so has passed.

9 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a
10 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the
11 findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

12 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations issued on December 1, 2020 (Doc. No. 270),
14 are ADOPTED in full;
- 15 2. Defendants Adams, Brooks, Chastain, Comates, Davis, Grannis, Guzman, Hough,
16 Junious, Neri, Rosenthal, Sheppard-Brooks, and Wortmanbe are DISMISSED;
- 17 3. The claims in Plaintiff's third-amended complaint (Doc. No. 117) are
18 DISMISSED, *except* for its claims of retaliation against Defendants Daveiga and
19 Ruiz, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983;
- 20 4. The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to rename this case "*Navarro v. Daveiga, et*
21 *al.*"; and
- 22 5. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: January 5, 2021

25 
26 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

27
28