

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BILAL AHDOM,

Plaintiff,

v.

ENENMOH, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:10-cv-00816-OWW-GBC (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
(Docs. 4, 13, 16)

ORDER DENYING SUPPLEMENTAL  
MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  
(Doc. 18)

Bilal Ahdom ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, 42 U.S.C. § 12132, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and § 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (RA). On May 11, 2010, Plaintiff filed his original complaint. (Doc. 1). On May 13, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion for injunctive relief and on October 6, 2010, Plaintiff filed a renewed motion for injunctive relief. (Docs. 4, 13). The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On February 24, 2011, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations herein which was served on Plaintiff and which contained notice that any objections to the Findings and Recommendations were to be filed within thirty days. Plaintiff filed an additional motion for injunctive relief on March 2, 2011, and filed an objection to the Findings and Recommendations on March 21, 2011. In his objection, Plaintiff argues, among other things, that his requests for injunctive relief is not based on a disagreement between his medical opinion and that of prison medical authorities but

1 rather a disagreement between his neurologist and prison officials. (Doc. 19 at 4). However, as  
2 discussed in the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff has not submitted a  
3 chrono stating that he must have a wheelchair accessible cell.

4 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a *de*  
5 *novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file and Plaintiff's objections, the Court  
6 finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

7 Moreover, Plaintiff's motion filed on March 2, 2011, does not meet the requirements for granting  
8 injunctive relief and is duplicative of the motions for injunctive relief filed on May 13, 2010, and  
9 October 6, 2010. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief filed on March 2, 2011, is DENIED.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 11 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed February 24, 2011, is adopted in full;
- 12 2. and Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief, filed May 13, 2010; October 6, 2010; and  
13 March 2, 2011; is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 **Dated: March 28, 2011**

**/s/ Oliver W. Wanger**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28