

1 food as well as excessive force incidents with prison officials (not Defendants).

2 The matter was referred to a United State Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
3 § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On July 14, 2011, the Magistrate Judge filed a
4 Findings and Recommendation recommending that Plaintiff's Motions be denied. (ECF
5 No. 48.) The Magistrate Judge found that Plaintiff failed to meet the legal prerequisites for
6 injunctive relief.¹ Plaintiff did not file any objections.
7

8 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has
9 conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the
10 Court finds the Findings and Recommendation to be supported by the record and by
11 proper analysis.
12

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 14 1. The Findings and Recommendation, filed July 14, 2011, is ADOPTED; and
15 2. Plaintiff's Motions for Temporary Restraining Orders and Preliminary
16 Injunctions are DENIED.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: August 26, 2011

19 
20 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

21
22
23
24
25 ¹ "A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the
26 merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of
27 equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest." Am. Trucking Ass'ns, Inc. v. City
of Los Angeles, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting Winter v. Natural Res. Defense Council,
129 S.Ct. 365, 374 (2008)).