1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	KARL VANDERVALL,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-09-1576 GEB DAD P
12	VS.
13	J. FELTNER, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action
17	seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate
18	Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.
19	On July 19, 2010, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein
20	which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to
21	
	the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty-one days. Neither party has
22	the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty-one days. Neither party has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.
22 23	
	filed objections to the findings and recommendations.
23	filed objections to the findings and recommendations. The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be
23 24	filed objections to the findings and recommendations. The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY
23 24 25	filed objections to the findings and recommendations. The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1	1. The findings and recommendations filed July 19, 2010 are adopted in full;
2	2. Defendants' December 18, 2009 motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 13) is granted in
3	part and denied in part as follows:
4	A. Defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiff's complaint as barred by the
5	favorable termination rule is denied;
6	B. Defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment Due
7	Process claims against defendants Feltner, Machado, Lackner, and Martel is granted;
8	C. Defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiff's First Amendment retaliation
9	claims against defendants Lackner and Martel is granted; and
10	D. Defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiff's First Amendment retaliation
11	claims against defendants Feltner and Machado on the grounds of qualified immunity is denied.
12	Dated: August 25, 2010
13	AUSD MI
14	GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
15	United States District Judge
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2

I