

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDRE' BOSTON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-1782 KJM DAD P

vs.

V. GARCIA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 27, 2011, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.


/////
/////
/////
/////

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule
2 304, this court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case.¹ Having carefully reviewed the file,
3 the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the
4 proper analysis.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. The findings and recommendations filed July 27, 2011, are adopted in full; and
- 7 2. Defendants Aguila, Bayles, Grannis, Harai, McDonald and Reinsel are
8 dismissed from this action.

9 DATED: October 17, 2011.

10 
11 _____
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 /bost1782.804
24 _____

25 ¹ The court notes that in screening the proposed amended complaint, in light of
26 plaintiff's *pro se* status, the magistrate judge examined the proposed amended complaint as he
would during a consideration of the propriety of a motion to amend. *See* FED. R. CIV. P.
15(a)(2).