


1 See Dkt. No. 48 at 2-3.

2 The Magistrate Judge's November 18, 2011, Order determined
3 that Plaintiff had adequately stated a claim for retaliation
4 against two of the correctional officers, defendants Briddle and
5 Davey, but had not adequately stated facts against the other
6 defendants named in the amended complaint. Dkt. No 61 at 3. In
7 addition, the Magistrate Judge held that Plaintiff had not
8 "stated a claim that he was denied access to the prison grievance
9 process and, by extension, the courts." Id. The Magistrate
10 Judge noted that even if the denial of Plaintiff's grievances
11 were improper, Plaintiff has not sufficiently alleged that he was
12 denied access to the courts. Id. The Magistrate Judge therefore
13 determined, inter alia, that this action could proceed against
14 defendants Briddle and Davey.

15 Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge's
16 orders shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to
17 law." Upon review of the entire file, the Court finds that it
18 does not appear that the magistrate judge's ruling was clearly
19 erroneous or contrary to law.

20 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration,
21 the order of the magistrate judge filed November 18, 2011, is
22 affirmed.

23 Dated: December 12, 2011

24 
25 _____
26 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28