| 1  |  |                            |
|----|--|----------------------------|
| 2  |  |                            |
| 3  |  |                            |
| 4  |  |                            |
| 5  |  |                            |
| 6  |  |                            |
| 7  |  |                            |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |                            |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |                            |
| 10 |  |                            |
| 11 | FELICIA CLARK,   | No. 2:15-cv-1211 JAM DB PS |
| 12 | Plaintiff,   |                            |
| 13 | V.   | ORDER                      |
| 14 | COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,  |                            |
| 15 | Defendants.  |                            |
| 16 |  |                            |
| 17 | Plaintiff is proceeding pro se with the above-entitled action. The matter was referred to a      |                            |
| 18 | United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21).                                |                            |
| 19 | On July 26, 2016, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which           |                            |
| 20 | were served on all parties and which contained notice to the parties that any objections to the  |                            |
| 21 | findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days after service of the findings |                            |
| 22 | and recommendations. The fourteen-day period has expired, and no party has filed objections to   |                            |
| 23 | the findings and recommendations.  |                            |
| 24 | The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be                 |                            |
| 25 | supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis.                                  |                            |
| 26 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:  |                            |
| 27 | 1. The findings and recommendations filed July 26, 2016 (Dkt. No. 18) are                        |                            |
| 28 | adopted in full;   |                            |
|    |  |                            |

1

| 1  | 2. Defendants' January 8, 2016 motion to dismiss (Dkt No. 11) is granted in part                          |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | and denied in part;   |  |
| 3  | 3. The complaint's claims for illegal seizure, Monell, and violation of the ADA                           |  |
| 4  | are dismissed with leave to amend;  |  |
| 5  | 4. Plaintiff is granted twenty-eight days to file an amended complaint that cures                         |  |
| 6  | the defects noted in this order and complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the            |  |
| 7  | Local Rules of Practice <sup>1</sup> ; and  |  |
| 8  | 5. If after the twenty-eight days has passed plaintiff has not filed an amended                           |  |
| 9  | complaint, defendants are directed to file an answer within fourteen days to the complaint's              |  |
| 10 | claims of retaliation, false arrest and excessive force.  |  |
| 11 | DATED: August 31, 2016  |  |
| 12 | John A. Mendez  |  |
| 13 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE  |  |
| 14 |   |  |
| 15 |   |  |
| 16 |   |  |
| 17 |   |  |
| 18 |   |  |
| 19 |   |  |
| 20 |   |  |
| 21 |   |  |
| 22 |   |  |
| 23 | /clark.jo   |  |
| 24 |   |  |
| 25 |   |  |
| 26 |   |  |
| 27 | $\frac{1}{1}$ It appears plaintiff has already filed an amended complaint in response to the findings and |  |
| 28 | recommendations.  |  |