| (PC) Scott v. | . McDonald | |
|---------------|---|-----------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 8 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | HOWARD SCOTT, | No. 2:09-cv-00851-MCE-EFB P |
| 11 | Plaintiff, | |
| 12 | VS. | <u>ORDER</u> |
| 13 | M. MCDONALD, et al., | |
| 14 | Defendants. | |
| 15 | | / |
| 16 | Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief | |
| 17 | under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to | |
| 18 | 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. | |
| 19 | On December 5, 2011, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein | |
| 20 | which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to | |
| 21 | the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days from the date the | |
| 22 | findings and recommendations were served. Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and | |
| 23 | recommendations. | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | /// | |
| | | 1 |

Doc. 78

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations filed December 5, 2011 (ECF No. 66), are ADOPTED in full; and
 - 2. Plaintiff's July 21, 2011 motion for injunctive relief (ECF No. 51) is DENIED.

Dated: February 7, 2012

MORRISON C. ENGLAND) JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE