



1 state a cognizable claim against defendants Furcher and Sturm in Count V of the complaint. (ECF  
2 No. 11, at p. 7). This is an accurate characterization of the Court's screening order. Plaintiff did not  
3 allege facts anywhere in the complaint to state a cognizable claim against defendants Furcher and  
4 Sturm. As such, these two defendants should have been dismissed from this action in the screening  
5 order. The Court grants defendants' motion for clarification and now dismisses defendants Furcher  
6 and Sturm from this action, as specified below. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a); 28 U.S.C.  
7 § 1915A(b)(1),(2).

8 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that defendants' motion for clarification (ECF No. 168) is  
9 **GRANTED**.

10 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that defendants Furcher and Sturm are **DISMISSED WITH**  
11 **PREJUDICE** from this action.

12 Dated this 21<sup>st</sup> day of September, 2012.

13   
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26