(PC) Diaz v.	Martel et al		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	RANDOLPH DIAZ,		
11	Plaintiff,	No. 2:10-cv-1388-MCE-KJN-P	
12	vs.		
13	M. MARTEL, 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 December 7, 2012, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations		
20	herein (ECF No. 30) which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties		
21	that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days.		
22	Neither party has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.		
23	The Court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be		
24	supported by the record and by the Magistrate Judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY		
25	ORDERED that:		
26	////		
		1	

Doc. 31

1	1. The findings and recommendations filed December 7, 2012 (ECF No. 30) are	
2	ADOPTED IN FULL;	
3	2. Defendants' motion to dismiss (ECF No. 22) is GRANTED IN PART and	
4	DENIED IN PART;	
5	3. Defendant Smith is DISMISSED from this action without prejudice;	
6	4. Summary judgment in favor of Defendant Hashimoto is GRANTED with	
7	respect to Plaintiff's pendent state law claims for damages; and	
8	5. This action shall proceed against Defendant Hashimoto based on Plaintiff's	
9	Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim.	
10	DATED: January 29, 2013	
11	Alan III	
12	MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR., CHIEF JUDGE	
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
ا ہ		