1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 8 LAUSTEVEION JOHNSON, 9 CASE NO.: 3:14-CV-00178-RCJ-VPC 10 Plaintiff, ORDER 11 v. 12 N. YOUNG, et al., 13 Defendant. 14 15 Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge (#60 and 61¹) 16 entered on October 8-9, 2015, recommending that the Court deny Plaintiff's Motion for Summary 17 Judgment (ECF #38/56) and grant and deny in part Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF 18 #36). On October 26, 2015 Plaintiff filed his Objections to Magistrates Report and Recommendation on 19 Dispositive Motions (ECF #63). On October 26, 2015 Defendants filed a Limited Objection to 20 Magistrate's Report and Recommendation (ECF#64). On November 9, 2015 Plaintiff filed his Response 21 to Defendants Objection to Magistrate Report and Recommendation (ECF #65). On November 9, 2015 22 Defendants filed thier Opposition to Plaintiff's Objection to Magistrate's Report and Recommendation 23 on Dispositive Motions (ECF #66). 24 The Court has conducted it's *de novo* review in this case, has fully considered the objections of 25 the Plaintiff, the pleadings and memoranda of the parties and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule IB 3-2. The Court determines that the Magistrate Judge's 26 27 Report and Recommendation (#60/61) entered on October 8-9, 2015, should be ADOPTED AND 28 ACCEPTED.

¹Refers to court's docket number.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF #36) is GRANTED as to Plaintiff's First Amendment Retaliation Claim against Defendants Baker, Cox, and Moore; First Amendment Access to the Courts Claims; and Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Claims, but DENIED as to Plaintiff's First Amendment Retaliation Claim against Defendant Young.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF #38/56) is DENIED in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 18th day of November, 2015.

ROBERT C. JOI