By Order filed on May 28, 2013, the district judge rejected the finding that plaintiff's complaint was untimely, but adopted the Findings and Recommendations on all other grounds. ECF No. 36. The clerk thereafter entered judgment in this case. ECF No. 37. Entry of judgment was in error, however, because the effect of the district court's order was to dismiss plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim only insofar as it seeks (1) injunctive relief and (2) damages from defendants Naku and Traquina. As to defendants Basi, Lahey and Villote, the undersigned had stated in the Findings and Recommendations:

The allegations against Dr. Basi and nurses Lahey and Villote, on the other hand, present potentially viable claims. These three

defendants were medical providers with whom plaintiff interacted. Dr. Basi is alleged to have prescribed a dangerous medication

without advising plaintiff of the dangers or of the available alternatives, including surgery. Plaintiff alleges that if he had been

properly informed, he would have elected surgery and not taken the Terazosin. Following Dr. Basi's advice caused him to lose his

vision in one eye. Defendants Basi, Lahey and Villote all allegedly failed to provide or to ensure prompt treatment when the blindness

began, resulting in permanent blindness. As to these defendants, the complaint arguably alleges (or might allege if leave to amend were

available) specific acts that caused plaintiff's injury and that were committed with deliberate indifference to plaintiff's medical need.

8

11

10

1213

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ECF No. 31 at 15-16.

Accordingly, following Judge Nunley's order this action proceeds on plaintiff's claim of deliberate indifference to a serious medical condition in violation of the Eighth Amendment against defendants Basi, Lahey and Villote. Under Rule 60(a), "[t]he court may correct a clerical mistake or a mistake arising from oversight or omission whenever one is found in a judgment, order, or other part of the record." This correction can be ordered by the court "on motion or on its own, with or without notice." <u>Id</u>. The clerk will be directed to re-open this erroneously closed case. The remaining defendants must file their answer(s) within thirty days.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1. This case, having been closed in error due to a clerical mistake, is hereby ordered reopened pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a);
- 2. This action proceeds on plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim of deliberate indifference to a serious medical condition for money damages against defendants Basi, Lahey and Villote;

1	and
2	3. The remaining defendants must file their answer(s) within thirty days of the date of this
3	order.
4	DATED: October 22, 2013
5	auson Clane
6	ALLISON CLAIRE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7	
8	
9	
10	AC:009 reec2712.ord
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	