

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

reasserts many of the arguments he previously raised before the magistrate judge. (Doc. No. 194.)

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

Accordingly,

1. The April 7, 2016 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 187) are adopted in full;
2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to strike plaintiff's declaration (Doc. No. 169) from this case and to file it as a complaint in an entirely new civil action on plaintiff's behalf;
3. Plaintiff's motion to file an amended complaint (Doc. No. 174), filed March 7, 2016, is denied; and
4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to strike plaintiff's amended complaint (Doc. No. 173), lodged on March 7, 2016, from the record in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 13, 2016


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE