1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DIS	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	JON-ERIK ROOSEVELT BOLDS, JR.,) Case No. 1:21-cv-01668-DAD-SAB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,) FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
13	V.	RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AND DEFENDANTS, AND DENYING
14	LEUVANOS, et al.,	 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME AS UNNECESSARY
15	Defendants.) (ECF Nos. 22, 28, 29)
16		_)
17	Plaintiff Jon-Erik Roosevelt Bolds, Jr., is proceeding <i>pro se</i> and <i>in forma pauperis</i> in this civil	
18	rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
19	On April 15, 2022, the Court screened Plaintiff's complaint and found a cognizable excessive	
20	force claims against Defendant Luevanos for the incident on May 28, 2021, and against Defendants	
21	Luevanos, Valluas, Lucos, Magania, and Flores for the incident on September 21, 2021, and a cognizable	
22	retaliation claim against Defendants Lucos, Sosa, Bailey, Rafferty, and Espericueta. (ECF No. 22.)	
23	However, Plaintiff fails to state any other cognizable claims for relief. Therefore, Plaintiff was informed	
24	that he could file an amended complaint or a notice of intent to proceed on the claims found to be	
25	cognizable. (<u>Id.</u>)	
26	On May 23, 2022, Plaintiff timely notified the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims	
27	found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 28.) Therefore, the Court will recommend that this action proceed	
28	only on Plaintiff's excessive force claims again	inst Defendant Luevanos for the incident on May 28, 2021,

1	and against Defendants Luevanos, Valluas, Lucos, Magania, and Flores for the incident on September 21		
2	2021, and retaliation claim against Defendants Lucos, Sosa, Bailey, Rafferty, and Espericueta. Fed. R.		
3	Civ. P. 8(a); <u>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</u> , 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009); <u>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</u> , 550 U.S.		
4	544, 555 (2007); <u>Hebbe v. Pliler</u> , 627 F.3d 338, 342 (9th Cir. 2010).		
5	Accordingly, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:		
6	1. This action proceed only on Plaintiff's excessive force claims against Defendant		
7	Luevanos for the incident on May 28, 2021, and against Defendants Luevanos, Valluas,		
8	Lucos, Magania, and Flores for the incident on September 21, 2021, and retaliation claim		
9	against Defendants Lucos, Sosa, Bailey, Rafferty, and Espericueta;		
10	2. All other claims and Defendants be dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim;		
11	and		
12	3. Plaintiff's motion for extension of time to respond to the Court's April 15, 2022, is		
13	denied as unnecessary.		
14	These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge		
15	assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen (14) days		
16	after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may file written objections		
17	with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and		
18	Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may		
19	result in the waiver of rights on appeal. <u>Wilkerson v. Wheeler</u> , 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)		
20	(citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).		
21			
22	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
23	Dated: May 26, 2022		
24	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
25			
26			
27			
28			
	2		