UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER G. VALENCIA, Plaintiff, v. MEDINA, et al., Defendants.	No. 1:22-cv-00569-JLT-SAB (PC) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Doc. 25)

On September 24, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued Findings and Recommendations, finding Plaintiff's second amended complaint raises viable Eighth Amendment failure to protect and deliberate indifference to serious medical needs claims (Claims One and Two) against Defendant Samantha Medina, a supervising officer at California State Prison – Corcoran, but failed to state a cognizable claim for excessive force. (Doc. 25.) Plaintiff filed objections on October 10, 2025. (Doc. 31.)

According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff's objections, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Contrary to Plaintiff's insistence that his "torture" claim against Defendant Medina should be allowed to proceed (Doc. 31 at 2–3), the Court agrees with the magistrate judge that Plaintiff has failed to allege facts to support an *independent* claim that Defendant Medina

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

"tortured" Plaintiff, a claim the magistrate judge reasonably interpreted as being akin to a claim for excessive force. The facts to which Plaintiff refers, including the allegation that Defendant Medina "laughed" with fellow officers who then "retreated into the 3B program office, leaving the plaintiff behind to suffer the effects of the gas," (Doc. 18 at 2), have not been disregarded. Rather, they are relevant to the claims that are being permitted to proceed. Plaintiff's remaining arguments and requests are procedurally unjustified or substantively incorrect. Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on September 24, 2025, are **ADOPTED IN FULL**. (Doc. 25.)
2. This case proceeds only against Defendant Samantha Medina failure to protect and deliberate indifference to serious medical needs claims in violation of the Eighth Amendment.
3. Plaintiff's excessive force claim is dismissed without further leave to amend.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 25, 2025**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE