

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

JAMES WILLIAM ROBINSON,

CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00349-OWW-GBC PC

Plaintiff,

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDING  
DENYING PLAINTIFF’S REQUESTS FOR  
JUDICIAL NOTICE, REQUESTS FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, AND  
REQUESTS FOR SANCTIONS

v.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.,

Defendants.

(ECF Nos. 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21,  
22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 32)

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff James William Robinson (“Plaintiff”) is a former state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action was filed in Superior Court of the State of California on December 11, 2008. (Doc. 1-2.) On February 20, 2009, Defendants removed the action to federal Court. (ECF No. 1.) The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

Plaintiff filed requests for judicial notice on October 2, 19, December 14, 2009; January 15, February 18, March 2, April 22, July 1, 2, 9, 15; August 11, and September 23, 2010. (ECF Nos. 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 32.) On May 13, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary injunction. (ECF No. 21.) On December 1, 2010, the Magistrate Judge filed [findings and recommendations](#) herein which was served on the parties and which contained notice to the parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within thirty days. (ECF No. 34.) Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to file objections to findings and

1 recommendations on December 27, 2010 and a motion for a second extension of time on February  
2 3, 2011. (ECF Nos. 36, 38.) The motions were granted and the time for Plaintiff to file his objections  
3 has passed and no objections were filed.

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

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 8 1. The findings and recommendations, filed December 1, 2010, is adopted in full;
- 9 2. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction filed May 13, 2010, is DENIED; (ECF  
10 No. 21)
- 11 3. Plaintiff's request for sanctions filed October 2, 2009, is DENIED; (ECF No. 11) and
- 12 4. Plaintiff's requests for judicial notice filed October 2, 19, December 14, 2009; January  
13 15, February 18, March 2, April 22, July 1, 2, 9, 15; August 11, and September 23,  
14 2010, are DENIED. (ECF Nos. 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27,  
15 32.)

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 **Dated: March 21, 2011**

/s/ Oliver W. Wanger  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28