

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALBERTO VILLESCAS,
Plaintiff,
v.
RAFAEL MIRANDA, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-1861 TLN KJN P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 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 October 30, 2015, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on Plaintiff and which contained notice to Plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days.

The magistrate judge recommended that Plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief, filed October 8, 2015, be denied. On November 5, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to file a response to the opposition to his motion filed on October 23, 2015 by the Office of the Attorney General. (ECF No. 19.) On November 5, 2015, Plaintiff filed this response. (ECF No. 21.) On November 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 22.) Plaintiff’s objections are similar to his November 5, 2015 responsive pleading.


1 Because the magistrate judge did not authorize Plaintiff to file a responsive pleading, and
2 because Plaintiff's response is similar to his objections, Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time
3 to file his response is denied and the response is disregarded. The Court instead has reviewed and
4 considered Plaintiff's objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 22.)

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

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 10 1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 19) is denied and Plaintiff's
11 response (ECF No. 21) is disregarded;
- 12 2. The findings and recommendations filed October 30, 2015, are adopted in full;
- 13 3. Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order (ECF No. 11), and Plaintiff's
14 supplemental briefing in support of this motion (ECF No. 17), are denied without prejudice.

15 Dated: January 8, 2016

16
17
18 
19 _____
20 Troy L. Nunley
21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28