

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

BARRY LOUIS LAMON,)	Case No.: 1:20-cv-00896-AWI-SAB (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
v.)	RECOMMENDATIONs
)	
C. PFEIFFER, et.al.,)	
)	(Doc. No. 24)
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Barry Louis Lamon is appearing *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Eastern District of California Local Rule 302.

On October 30, 2020, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that this action proceed on Plaintiff’s separate claims for retaliation against Defendants Jones, Moffett, Moore, Alvarez, Eaker, Gonzalez, Rivera-Sierra, Ronquillo, Luna, Ramirez, Goss, Bennett-Beach, and Velasco; for failure to protect against Defendants Corona, Loera, Ramirez, Eaker, Luna, Jones, Moffett, Moore, Alvarez, Ronquillo, Luna, Rivera-Sierra, and Clare; for a Bane Act violation against Defendants Corona, Loera, Jones, Moffett, Moore, Alvarez, Eaker, Gonzalez, Rivera-Sierra, Ronquillo, Luna, Ramirez, Goss, Bennett-Beach, and Velasco; and for intentional infliction of

1 emotional distress against Defendants Corona, Loera, Jones, Moffett, Moore, Alvarez, Eaker,
2 Gonzalez, Rivera-Sierra, Ronquillo, Luna, Ramirez, Goss, Bennett-Beach, Velasco; and that all other
3 claims and Defendants be dismissed from the action. Doc. No. 24. The findings and
4 recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that objections were due within
5 fourteen days. Id. No objections were filed and the time to do so has now expired.

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

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 10 1. The findings and recommendations issued by the Magistrate Judge on October 30, 2020
11 (Doc. No. 24), are adopted in full;
- 12 2. This action shall proceed on Plaintiff's separate claims for retaliation against Defendants
13 Jones, Moffett, Moore, Alvarez, Eaker, Gonzalez, Rivera-Sierra, Ronquillo, Luna,
14 Ramirez, Goss, Bennett-Beach, and Velasco; for failure to protect against Defendants
15 Corona, Loera, Ramirez, Eaker, Luna, Jones, Moffett, Moore, Alvarez, Ronquillo, Luna,
16 Rivera-Sierra, and Clare; for a Bane Act violation against Defendants Corona, Loera,
17 Jones, Moffett, Moore, Alvarez, Eaker, Gonzalez, Rivera-Sierra, Ronquillo, Luna,
18 Ramirez, Goss, Bennett-Beach, and Velasco; and for intentional infliction of emotional
19 distress against Defendants Corona, Loera, Jones, Moffett, Moore, Alvarez, Eaker,
20 Gonzalez, Rivera-Sierra, Ronquillo, Luna, Ramirez, Goss, Bennett-Beach, Velasco;
- 21 3. All other claims and Defendants are dismissed from the action; and
- 22 4. The matter is referred back to the magistrate judge for initiation of service of process.

23
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: December 21, 2020


26 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE