26

proper analysis.

Doc. 38

Specifically, defendants claim that the magistrate recommended granting plaintiff leave to amend Count 2 as to defendants Maness and Cannon only, and asks that all remaining defendants be dismissed with prejudice. See ECF No. 29 at 2-3. Defendants are incorrect. The magistrate instead recommended dismissing count two with leave to amend "that portion of his complaint concerning his treatment, or non-treatment, for hepatitis and cirrhosis," and also specifically noted that plaintiff had failed to identify the appropriate defendants for his claim. ECF No. 28 at 14-15. Defendants' objections will be overruled.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Defendants' objections, filed January 17, 2013, (ECF No. 29) are overruled;
- 2. The findings and recommendations filed January 14, 2013 are adopted in full;
- 3. Defendants' motion to dismiss (ECF No. 13) is granted, and plaintiff is granted leave to amend the complaint as to Count 2 only.

DATED: March 18, 2013

/s/ John A. Mendez UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE