UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM SOTO, Plaintiff, v. SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF, et al., Defendants.	No. 2:25-cv-01310-DAD-DMC (PC) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Doc. No. 9)

Plaintiff William Soto is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 28, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint and found that plaintiff failed to state a cognizable § 1983 claim against defendant Mora's supervisors because plaintiff had not alleged how those supervisors' actions caused a constitutional deprivation to plaintiff, that plaintiff had failed to state a cognizable excessive force claim against defendant Mora because the alleged use of force was purportedly directed at a person other than plaintiff, and that plaintiff had failed to state a cognizable Eighth Amendment claim regarding denial of his access to television because that allegation standing alone does not demonstrate actionable conduct related to plaintiff's conditions of confinement (Doc. No. 8 at 3–5.)

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Accordingly, the magistrate judge granted plaintiff leave to amend to address the deficiencies identified in that screening order by filing an amended complaint. (*Id.* at 6.) Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint within the time provided and the time in which to do so has passed. On January 30, 2026, the magistrate judge therefore issued findings and recommendations recommending that this action proceed on plaintiff's complaint (Doc. No. 1) solely as to his Eighth Amendment claim based upon the alleged denial of telephone access brought against defendant Mora. (Doc. No. 9.)

The pending findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 3.) To date, no parties have filed objections to the pending findings and recommendations and the time in which to do so has passed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the pending findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

For the reasons above,

1. The findings and recommendations issued on January 30, 2026 (Doc. No. 9) are ADOPTED in full;
2. This action proceeds on the cognizable claims identified in the assigned magistrate judge's findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 9 at 3);
3. All other claims and defendants are DISMISSED; and
4. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings consistent with this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **April 24, 2026**

Dale A. Drozd

DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE