

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALLEN B. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MATTHEW CATE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:09-cv-00468 OWW JLT (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. 64)

_____ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights action pursuant to 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 February 9, 2011, the assigned magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations recommending that Plaintiff’s two requests for preliminary injunctions be denied. (Doc. 64.) The assigned magistrate judge explained that this action is proceeding only on Plaintiff’s claims against Defendants Wegman, Gonzales, Howard, Ortiz, and Bradley regarding the alleged obstruction of Plaintiff’s religious practices, and the Court lacks jurisdiction to issue injunctive relief regarding matters outside this case. (Id. at 2.) To the extent that Plaintiff seeks relief based on new claims, the assigned magistrate judge advised Plaintiff to file a new civil rights action. (Id.)

The findings and recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty-one days. (Id.) On

1 February 24, 2011, Plaintiff filed timely objections to the assigned magistrate judge's findings and
2 recommendations. (Doc. 69.)

3 In accordance with 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302, the Court has conducted a
4 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file for this case, including the
5 objections filed by Plaintiff, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by
6 the record and proper analysis.

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 8 1. The findings and recommendations issued by the assigned magistrate judge on
9 February 9, 2011 (Doc. 64) are adopted in full;
- 10 2. Plaintiff's April 2, 2010 request for a preliminary injunction (Doc. 32) is DENIED;
11 and
- 12 3. Plaintiff's July 1, 2010 request for a preliminary injunction (Doc. 52) is DENIED. IT
13 IS SO ORDERED.

14 **Dated:** March 2, 2011 /s/ Oliver W. Wanger
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE