

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

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| ALVARO QUEZADA, |) | CASE NO.: 1:06-CV-01088-OWW-GBC (PC) |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND |
| |) | RECOMMENDATIONS |
| v. |) | |
| |) | (Docs. 55, 57, 59) |
| B. GRICEWICH, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |

Plaintiff Alvaro Quezada, (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in 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 August 11, 2010, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations herein which was served on the Plaintiff and which contained notice to the Plaintiff that any objections to the Findings and Recommendations were to be filed within thirty days. The Plaintiff filed an objection to the Findings and Recommendations on August 27, 2010. In his objection, Plaintiff asserts that the Magistrate Judge’s requirement that Plaintiff obtain leave from the Court prior to filing an opposition that is greater than 50 pages in length (including exhibits) interferes with Plaintiff’s access to the courts and that the Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations

1 violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments. A specific description of each document and
2 justification for copying has not been provided, despite opportunity to do so.

3 The Plaintiff's objection has not presented facts or law which would demonstrate that the
4 Findings and Recommendations should not be adopted. In accordance with the provisions of 28
5 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully
6 reviewed the entire file and Plaintiff's objections, the Court finds the Findings and
7 Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 9 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed August 11, 2010, is adopted in full.
- 10 2. Plaintiff's motions for preliminary injunctive relief is DENIED. IT IS SO
11 ORDERED.

12 **Dated:** November 30, 2010 /s/ Oliver W. Wanger
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28