



1 contained a notice that any objections were due within fourteen days of the date of service. (Doc.  
2 15 at 2.) The Court advised him that “[f]ailure to file objections within the specified time may  
3 result in waiver of rights on appeal.” (*Id.*, citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th  
4 Cir. 2014) (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991).) Plaintiff did not file  
5 objections, and the time to do so has expired.

6 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court conducted a *de novo* review of this  
7 case. Having carefully reviewed the entire matter, the Court concludes the Findings and  
8 Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court **ORDERS:**

- 9 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on June 1, 2023 (Doc. 15) are  
10 **ADOPTED** in full.
- 11 2. The action **SHALL** proceed only on Plaintiff’s claims for retaliation in violation  
12 of the First Amendment (claim one) and failure to protect under the Eighth  
13 Amendment (claim two).
- 14 3. The remaining claim (claim three) is **DISMISSED**.
- 15 4. This action is referred to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings.

16  
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: July 17, 2023

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28