



1 *Machines*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981). As to any portion of the proposed findings of  
2 fact to which no objection has been made, the court assumes its correctness and decides the  
3 motions on the applicable law. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979).  
4 The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed *de novo*. *See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified*  
5 *Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

6 As the court originally noted in the order of June 17, 2013, the magistrate judge  
7 did not properly evaluate the claims against defendant Hoffman and so the court declined to adopt  
8 the findings and recommendations as to her. Plaintiff's objections do not alter this conclusion.

9 In sum, the court adopts the Findings and Recommendations except with respect to  
10 defendant Hoffman.


11 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

12 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed February 8, 2013, are adopted in part  
13 and the claims against defendant Wood are dismissed;

14 2. The Findings and Recommendations are not adopted as to defendant Hoffman  
15 and the case is referred back to the magistrate judge for screening as to this defendant; this court  
16 expresses no opinion on the adequacy of the claims against defendant Hoffman; and

17 3. Plaintiff's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is granted;

18 DATED: September 30, 2014.

19  
20  
21   
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28