1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	DANIEL E. GONZALEZ,	No. 2:15-cv-1997 MCE DB PS
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff is proceeding pro se with the	e above-entitled action. The matter was referred to a
18	United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21).	
19	On November 18, 2016, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein	
20	which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the	
21	findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days after service of the findings	
22	and recommendations. Plaintiff has filed objection to the findings and recommendations.	
23	The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be	
24	supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis.	
25	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
26	1. The findings and recommendations filed November 18, 2016 (ECF No. 11) are adopted	
27	in full;	
28	////	
		1

<ul> <li>state law<sup>2</sup> causes of action; and</li> <li>3. The amended complaint's state law causes of action are dismissed without prejudic</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>Dated: January 5, 2017</li> <li>MORRISON C. ENGLANO, JR.</li> <li>NORRISON C. ENGLANO, JR.</li> <li>UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>3. The amended complaint's state law causes of action are dismissed without prejudic</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>Dated: January 5, 2017</li> <li>MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.</li> <li>NORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.</li> <li>UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE</li> <li>III</li> <li>IIII</li> <li>IIII</li> <li>IIII</li> <li>IIII</li> <li>IIII</li> <li>IIII</li> <li>IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII</li></ul>	1	2. The court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction <sup>1</sup> over the amended complaint's
4       IT IS SO ORDERED.         5       Dated: January 5, 2017         7       January 5, 2017         8       MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR         9       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE         9       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE         10       Interpretation of the states of the stat	2	state law <sup>2</sup> causes of action; and
<ul> <li>Dated: January 5, 2017</li> <li>Dated: January 5, 2017</li> <li>MORRISON C. ENGLANO, JR</li> <li>NOTHED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE</li> <li>UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE</li> <li>INITED STATES DISTRICT STATES DISTRICT STATES DISTRICT JUDGE</li> <li>INITED STATES DISTRICT S</li></ul>	3	3. The amended complaint's state law causes of action are dismissed without prejudice.
6       Dated: January 5, 2017         7       Junce Juncom Junce Junce Junce Junce Junce Junce Junce Junce Jun	4	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7       8       MORRISON C. ENGLANO, IR UNITED STATES DISTRICTION         9       10       11         10       11       12         13       14       15         16       17       18         17       18       19         20	5	
<ul> <li>MORRISON C. ENGLAND, IR MORRISON C. ENGLAND, IR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims age the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim age the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against the cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded o diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>	6	Dated: January 5, 2017
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT STATES DISTRICT JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT STATES DISTRICT JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT STATES AND THE STATES DISTRICT STATES	7	Moun 16 1.
<ul> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims again the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim again the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims again the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims again the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims against the medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against the cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded of diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>	8	
<ul> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims again the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim again the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>	9	
<ul> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims agather non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim agather United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims agather united States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims agather united States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims agather united States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims agather united States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims agather united States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims agather the claim algorither evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against them cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>	10	
<ul> <li><sup>13</sup></li> <li><sup>14</sup></li> <li><sup>15</sup></li> <li><sup>16</sup></li> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims aga the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim ag the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claim ag Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded of diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>	11	
<ul> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims aga the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim aga the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded of diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>	12	
<ul> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims agather non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S \$ 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim agather United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>	13	
<ul> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20 <ul> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims age the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim age the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20 <sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims age the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claims age the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li><sup>18</sup></li> <li><sup>19</sup></li> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims age the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim age the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li><sup>19</sup></li> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims aga the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim ag the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded of diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li><sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims aga the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim ag the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>		
<sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims aga the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S § 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim aga the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States. <sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded of diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose		
<ul> <li>ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S</li> <li>§ 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim ag</li> <li>the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga</li> <li>Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than</li> <li>medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in</li> <li>medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then</li> <li>cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or</li> <li>diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff</li> </ul>		<sup>1</sup> According to the operative First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff alleges the claims against
<ul> <li>§ 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim age the United States. Here, however, as the magistrate judge correctly points out, the claims aga Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>		the non-governmental parties, Defendants Pugh and CSAA, belong in this lawsuit as pendent and ancillary claims as to which the Court can exercise its supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.
<ul> <li>Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than medical malpractice claim levied against the government. CSAA and Pugh played no role in medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against them cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>		§ 1367 since those claims share the same "common nucleus of operative fact" as the claim against
<ul> <li>medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against then cannot be pursued in Plaintiff's lawsuit against the United States.</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>		Pugh and CSAA involve different defendants, different evidence and different witnesses than the
<ul> <li>Plaintiff cannot successfully argue that she has identified a federal claim grounded or</li> <li>diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintif</li> <li>First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose</li> </ul>		medical care the United States provided to plaintiff, and consequently any claims against them
27 diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintif First Amended Complaint shows that Defendant CSAA is a California corporation whose	26	
		diversity of citizenship since, even if Defendant Pugh is a Hawaii resident, the face of Plaintiff's