

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAYMOND D. JACKSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
STEVEN PLETCHER, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2: 11-cv-1157 JAM KJN P

ORDER

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

On August 4, 2014, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and recommendations and defendant has filed a response to plaintiff's objections.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the

////

////

1 court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper
2 analysis.¹

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations filed August 4, 2014 are adopted in full; and
- 5 2. Defendant Osman's summary judgment motion (ECF No. 225) is granted.

6 DATED: November 3, 2014

7 /s/ John A. Mendez

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

¹ In his objections, plaintiff asserts, *inter alia*, that the magistrate judge erred in excluding the declaration of plaintiff's expert, Dr. Lopchinsky. Pls. Objs. at 2-3. This assertion is incorrect. Dr. Lopchinsky's declaration has not been excluded. It has been fully considered by the magistrate judge, see Findings and Recommendations (ECF No. 249) at 11-14, and by this court.