

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

BILAL AHDOM,	)	1:09-cv-01874-AWI-BAM (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
	)	RECOMMENDATIONS, DENYING
v.	)	MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
	)	INJUNCTION, MOTIONS TO TAKE
S. LOPEZ, et al.,	)	JUDICIAL NOTICE, AND MOTION FOR
	)	TRO/SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION FOR
Defendants.	)	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
	)	
	)	(Docs. 165, 169, 174, 180, 182, 183)
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Bilal Ahdom (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action proceeds on Plaintiff’s claims against Defendants Schaefer, Araich, Chen, Shittu, and Ashby for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

Currently before the Court are Plaintiff’s (1) motion for a preliminary injunction against Defendant Ashby, (Doc. 165); (2) motion to take judicial notice of documents in support of his motion, (Doc. 169); (3) second request to take judicial notice of documents in support of his motion, (Doc. 174); (4) request for a temporary restraining order and supplement to his pending request for a preliminary injunction, (Doc. 180); and (5) third request to take judicial notice of documents in support of his motion, (Doc. 182). On September 14, 2016, following careful consideration of these filings and Defendant Ashby’s response, the Magistrate Judge issued

1 Findings and Recommendations that all of the aforementioned motions and requests be denied.  
2 (Doc. 183.) The Findings and Recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice  
3 that any objections were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 8.) On  
4 September 28, 2016, Plaintiff filed objections to the Findings and Recommendations. (Doc. 185.)  
5 This Court finds no merit to Plaintiff's objections.

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(c), this Court has conducted  
7 a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff's  
8 objections, the Court finds that the Findings and Recommendation are supported by the record  
9 and proper analysis.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 11 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on September 14, 2016 (Doc. 183),  
12 are ADOPTED IN FULL;
- 13 2. Plaintiff's motions and requests to take judicial notice of documents (Docs. 169,  
14 174, 182), are DENIED;
- 15 3. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. 165), is DENIED; and
- 16 4. Plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order and/or supplement to the  
17 pending motion for preliminary injunction (Doc. 180), is DENIED.

18  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: September 29, 2016

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
21 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28