1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8	AURELIO MARTIN SEPULVEDA,	CASE NO. 1:05-CV-01143-AWI-DLB PC
9	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION AND DENYING
10	v.	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
11	JEANNE WOODFORD, et al.,	(DOCUMENTS #47 & #48)
12	Defendants.	$(\text{DOCOMENTS } \# \underline{+} \texttt{A} \# \underline{+} \texttt{O})$
13	/	
14		
15	Plaintiff Aurelio M. Sepulveda ("Plaintiff") is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se	
16	in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary	
17	injunction on February 16, 2011. Doc. 47. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate	
18	Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
19	On February 18, 2011, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations which	
20	was served on the parties and which contained notice to the parties that any objection to the Findings	
21	and Recommendations was to be filed within twenty-one days. Doc. 47. Plaintiff filed an Objection	
22	to the Findings and Recommendations on March 10, 2011. Doc. 51.	
23	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court has conducted a <u>de</u>	
24	<u>novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings and	
25	Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.	
26	Plaintiff contends that the medical care he seeks as an injunction is directly related to this	
27	action. However, this action concerns events that occurred at Corcoran State Prison, allegedly by	
28	Defendant Wu. The Court does not have the jurisdiction to enforce any injunction on prison officials 1	

1	at Ironwood State Prison or the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Zepeda	
2	v. United States Immigration Serv., 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1985).	
3	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
4	1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed February 18, 2011, is adopted in full; and	
5	2. Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction, filed February 16, 2011, is denied.	
6		
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
8	Dated: April 15, 2011 AMblin	
9	CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	2	