

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

CHARLES T. DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CLARK J. KELSO, et. al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:10-cv-01184-LJO-GBC (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS
(Doc. 19)

ORDER DENYING ADDITIONAL MOTION
FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
(Doc. 22)

I. Procedural History

Charles T. Davis (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 42 U.S.C. § 12132 (Americans with Disabilities Act). This action was filed on July 1, 2010. (Doc. 1). On September 16, 2010, Plaintiff filed two motions for injunctive relief. (Docs. 10, 11). On November 9, 2010, and November 29, 2010, Plaintiff filed renewed motions for emergency injunctive relief. (Docs. 12, 13). On May 13, 2011, an order was issued to file an additional preliminary injunction that was erroneously filed in another case. (Doc. 23). On October 4, 2010, Plaintiff filed an additional morion for preliminary injunction which was filed in this case on May 13, 2011. (Docs. 22, 23). Plaintiff is currently housed at Pleasant Valley State Prison (PVSP) and the events that give rise to the current requests for injunction occurred while a prisoner at PVSP. 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 May 10, 2011, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations herein which

1 was served on Plaintiff and which contained notice that any objections to the Findings and
2 Recommendations were to be filed within thirty days. Plaintiff filed objections to the Findings and
3 Recommendations on May 27, 2011. (Doc. 25).

4 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a
5 *de novo* review of this case. The Court has also reviewed Plaintiff's additional motion for injunctive
6 relief filed on October 4, 2010, which duplicates the motion for injunctive relief for pain medication
7 filed on September 16, 2010. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings
8 and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 10 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed May 10, 2011, is adopted in full; and
- 11 2. Plaintiff's motions for preliminary injunctive relief, filed September 16, 2010 (Docs.
12 10, 11), October 4, 2010 (Doc. 22), November 9, 2010 (Doc. 12), and November 29,
13 2010 (Doc. 13), are DENIED.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: June 2, 2011

17 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE